A SURVEY OF COLLEGE READING-IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS WITH FINDINGS RELATED TO SPECIFIC INSTITUTIONS IN THE UNITED NEGRO COLLEGE FUND PROGRAM

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION,

ATLANTA UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF

THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

BY

FREDERICK T. ANDERSON, JR.

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

ATLANTA, GEORGIA

AUGUST, 1965

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express his most sincere appreciation to all who contributed to this study. Especially, does he wish to express deep appreciation and thanks to:

1. Dr. Lynette Saine Gaines, advisor, who is by nature a scholar and who, from the very beginning, has demanded perfection and depth in all of my undertakings. To her, I am most grateful.

2. Mrs. Miriam Harvey Jellins, co-advisor, who was most helpful, in many ways, and who sought to eliminate my efforts to procrastinate; and, Dr. Mildred Barksdale, co-advisor, who inspired me to go forward with her confidence in my ability.

3. Mrs. Christine King Farris, Spelman College, my master teacher, who gave such positive direction as well as provided the atmosphere for the outgrowth of this research.

4. Mrs. Sadie V. George, Secretary to Dean Horace Mann Bond, School of Education, who is my friend and typist and who continually reminded me of deadlines and who encouraged me with her desire to see this project completed.

5. And, most of all, to my charming, devoted and understanding wife, Mary Shoffner Anderson, and our two youngsters, Allyson-Jenine and Frederick, III, who combined forces to see this dream a reality.

F. T. A.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Introductory statement.--Even a casual survey of the current scene shows that today's children and youth are growing up in a world that differs radically from that of the past. Contributing factors include the emergence of a world culture that must be understood and participated in intelligently; the explosive expansion of knowledge which must be understood and applied to constructive ends; notable technological developments which are changing the ways of man's patterns of living everywhere; the development of national ideologies and policies which call for vigorous effort if we are to exercise constructive leadership in all major fields of endeavors, and to preserve and improve the democratic pattern which as a nation we cherish.

As the significance of these and related changes has become clearer, strong societal pressure has developed and it dictates that children learn more extensively and thorough than in the past. To this end, education is assuming a new outlook and seriousness of purpose, and practically every curricular field is expanding rapidly and providing new and compelling motives for study. Two of the many pervasive aims that have emerged are to project youth and children into the mainstream of creative thought and effort that have characterized the progress of civilization, and to promote a better understanding of man -- his evolution, the values he prizes most highly, and his conception of himself and his role in today's

world.

Rationale.--In efforts to promote the high levels of competence needed today, the concept of reading as a process of experiencing and learning may be used as an initial guide. Of large importance, too, are each of four components of the reading act: namely, word perception, comprehension and the construing of meaning, thoughtful reaction to the ideas read, and assimilation or the integration of the ideas apprehended with previous experience. Fortunately, however, all these areas are being explored intensively in efforts to identify ways of developing more efficient readers.

In the past, schools have been judged by their graduates' academic success in college. While this trend continues to be true, it is equally true that schools are now being judged more and more by the business and industrial records of the students they graduate. By graduating students, the schools place the stamp of approval upon them, in effect. While many of them are a credit to their schools, unfortunately, some present an erroneous impression of what the schools are doing. The general public - not always as well informed as it should be regarding the meaning of universal education-is prone to blame the classroom.

Back in the Fourth Yearbook, Sommerfeld expressed concern about several trends involving the general public:

> Concern is also expressed about the rash of articles appearing in the current popular periodicals. The layman reads, and is influenced by, this popular literature, much of which, widely disseminated, is not psychologically sound.[1]

---

[1]Emery P. Bliesmer and Ralph C. Staiger, Problems, Programs and Projects in College-Adult Reading (Milwaukee: The National Reading Conference, Inc., 1962), pp. 210-212.

Certainly, if Sommerfeld's concerns were premature in 1954 we have every reason to be apprehensive today. A week rarely passes without one's receiving in the mail a brochure describing some new gadget designed to help in improving rate of reading. Thumb-latch tachistoscopes, motor-driven shutters, gravity-pulled bars, slit cut in cardboard - these soon to be followed by teaching machines. No one can scarcely name all of the packaged reading kits on the market.

A major part of the information refuting the charges made against current procedures in reading instruction is to be found in professional magazines. Gray and Iverson's "What Should Be the Profession's Attitude Toward Lay Criticism of the Schools? with Special Reference to Reading" is particularly appropriate.[1] General articles defending the schools have been written by Russell[2] and Witty.[3] The NEA[4] has assembled a portfolio of the answers to the recent book by Flesch.[5] A useful summary of evidence defending schools is to be found in the booklet Are We Teaching Reading? by Spache.[6]

Many of the criticisms of our educational system may be traced to

---

[1]William S. Gray and William S. Iverson, "What Should Be the Profession's Attitude Toward Lay Criticism of the Schools? With Special Reference to Reading," Elementary School Journal, LIII (September, 1952), p. 24.

[2]Davis S. Russell, "What Is Right with Our Public Schools," NEA Journal, XXXIX (May, 1950), pp. 366-367.

[3]Paul A. Witty, "Are Children Learning to Read?," School and Society, LXXV (May, 1952), pp. 289-294.

[4]National School Public Relations Association, "This Business About Johnny and His Reading: A Portfolio," (Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1956).

[5]Rudolph Flesch, Why Johnny Can't Read and What You Can Do About It, (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955).

[6]George D. Spache, Are We Teaching Reading? (Gainesville, Florida: University of Florida Press, 1956).

the neglect of instruction in reading. To neglect, ignore, or separate from instruction so important a thought-gaining process as reading compounds difficulties in areas of curriculum, mental health, and public relations. The contention offered here is that, within the present framework, there is ample room for improvement in reading. Two groups in our schools should be able to throw some light on the shortcomings of reading instruction. These two groups are the teachers and the students themselves.

The teacher of secondary students often knows very little about reading as it is taught. Indeed, he may be ignorant of the reading skills necessary to the successful reading of his subject. Again, he may understand both what has gone before and the skills required but still feel that it is not his job to teach boys and girls how to read his subject. He has to use the materials supplied him, so it is easier to keep everyone together in the same book. Besides, he has only so much time and the demands of the examinations have to be met. Thus, he reasons, reading instruction is not for him. But is he right?

The following are a few of the answers a sophomore girl gave on an open-end questionnaire about her reasons for dropping out of school:

> The subject giving me the most trouble - "anything with reading in it."
>
> School is - "pretty good until it comes to reading."
>
> Teachers could have helped me by - "showing me how to read my assignments."
>
> If I were a "big wheel," I'd see to it that - "my teachers knew how to teach reading."[1]

---

[1] J. Roy Newton, Reading in Your School (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960), p. 7.

Leaving school before graduation is an apparently easy solution to a complex problem; complex problems usually call for multiple solutions. It is indeed naive to suggest that continued instruction in reading will solve the dropout problem, but such instruction is one of the possible solutions.

Turning to the college student, it is possible to find that a parallel difficulty in reading exists. Colleges have gone on record as expecting secondary schools to teach their students to think, to write, to listen, and to read. This is precisely what the language arts program of the elementary school seeks to do. Somewhere along the line the schools are failing.

It is apparent that the field of reading improvement has many solid contributions to make to college and university educational efforts. Much progress has been made in this relatively young field, but the field has not yet "arrived." Workers in this area of educational effort need to be constantly striving to improve research knowledge, theory, and instructional practices. This work is eminently worthy of the most dedicated efforts of the best brains that we can find.[1]

The educational literature relating to reading, surveys of research and of resultant changes in classroom practices and programs and the considered judgment of specialists in the field, yield striking evidence of the expanding role of reading in the lives of children and adults. All sources of information point up the fact that reading instruction must increasingly contribute to the development of personalities with clear

---

[1]Stanley E. Davis, "Current Emphases in Reading Instruction in American Colleges and Universities," Reading in A Changing Society, LV (May, 1959), p. 59.

understanding and discriminating insight, capable of dealing with the new issues and problems - the social realities - of today.

Paralleling this interest in the social realities of today is the positively stated agreement among educators that reading instruction can contribute toward the development of an enlightened citizenry - stable personalities - capable of establishing the direction and form of the world society now in the making. It is the moral obligation of administrators and supervisors to assume leadership roles in the quest for new tools and new knowledge which will promote social understanding; the future demands acceptance of this high purpose.

It seems wise to conclude that future reading instruction programs will continue to give serious attention to translating what we know of how children can learn to understand and deal with social realities at their own levels of maturity into actual classroom instructional practices which will promote and sustain the development of social skills.

Evolution of the problem.--During the 1963-64 school year while serving as a graduate reading assistant at Atlanta University, the writer became interested in the development of college reading-improvement programs and desired to survey the literature to note the nature, materials and trends in order to relate these findings to a select group of institutions. It seemed advantageous to have a concise representation of the literature in order to aid institutions in broadening, strengthening or developing reading programs.

More interest was provoked while working with freshmen at one of the local colleges in the Center after realizing that they seemed deficient in achieving academically as rapidly as they should because of their in-

ability to perform as mature readers. Insights from other programs will, no doubt, be of use in helping these and other students.

Contribution to educational knowledge.--As research material is of little value to education unless it is used, it is felt that if the literature that has been written on college reading-improvement programs were surveyed and compiled in such a way that it was easily and readily accessible for use it would be most valuable for teachers, administrators or anyone interested in aiding students through strong, effective reading programs.

Statement of the problem.--This survey of college reading-improvement programs was two-fold in approach. First, through an intensive study of the literature an investigation was made of (1) the nature, (2) trends, (3) materials and equipment, and (4) reported results in reading programs and services for students throughout the nation; and, secondly, these findings were related to an actual survey of institutions which were actively participating in the United Negro College Fund program.

Purposes of the study.--The specific purposes of the study were:

1. To determine from the intensive study of the literature regarding reading-improvement programs:
    a. The presence or absence of a formal reading program
    b. Provisions for "slow," "average," and "able" readers
    c. The screening process used to detect students in need of special help in reading
    d. The extent of the testing program
    e. Provisions and policies for termination of training
    f. The department in which the reading classes or services were placed

g. The designation as a requirement or as a part of an orientation program

2. To classify reported results according to:

   a. The methods of instruction employed to accelerate achievement or eradicate the reading difficulties

   b. The types of reading aids and materials used

3. To determine any indications of agreement or disagreement with respect to the specific aspects of the programs reviewed in the literature

4. To obtain actual information from the selected group of institutions in terms of the specific categories surveyed in the literature regarding reading-improvement programs

5. To relate these findings to the general survey for purposes of evaluation, implications, and recommendations.

Limitations of the study.--This study was limited to the extensiveness of the literature pertinent to college reading-improvement programs with special emphasis on the nature, reported results, trends and materials.

The study was limited further in the success of the questionnaire as distributed to the participating colleges of The United Negro College Fund.

Method of research.--In this study the Descriptive Survey Method was used utilizing questionnaires.

Procedural steps.--The steps which were used to complete this study are outlined below:

1. The related literature pertinent to this study was reviewed and organized for presentation in the finished thesis.

2. A set of specific categories was formulated for purposes of studying reading-improvement programs in accordance with the purposes of the study.

3. Specific investigation of the literature was made in order to determine the status and characteristics of

reading-improvement classes and services.

4. The colleges and universities who were participating in The United Negro College Fund Program were issued questionnaires for execution and returning.

5. The findings were classified and interpreted according to the purposes of the study.

6. The findings were analyzed to determine any agreement or disagreement within and between categories.

7. The specific findings about colleges and universities in the United Negro College Fund Program were evaluated in terms of the larger survey of programs.

8. Conclusions, implications, and recommendations were drawn on the bases of the review of general programs, the canvassing of specific schools, and the evaluation of the latter in terms of general findings.

Survey of related literature.--The literature pertinent to this study will be reviewed under three headings: (1) Introductory comments concerning the need for college reading-improvement programs, (2) reasons for many reading problems faced by college students, (3) pertinent research on the effects of reading programs.

College reading programs established shortly after World War II were greeted with enthusiasm and many extravagant claims were made concerning their value. In some cases, the college reading program was regarded as a panacea for almost all of the difficulties encountered by students. In 1952, Bliesmer noted an impressive number of reports devoted merely to describing various types of programs.[1] In 1953, the same writer observed that "gains in reading abilities and skills were claimed by practically all who reported, or referred to actual programs; but bases for evaluating gains were considerably varied and were not clearly identified and tests

---

[1]Emery P. Bliesmer, "Recent Research In Reading on The College Level," Second Yearbook, Southwest Reading Conference, (Fort Worth, Texas: The Texas University Press, 1952), pp. 17-18.

of significance were 'significantly' lacking."[1] Bliesmer also noted that there was a tendency to over-generalize and to accept positive results uncritically.

Whether one likes it or not, American schools are faced with the task of dealing with inadequate readers or non-readers, in all their complicated befuddlement. They are fast becoming an important segment of the college group; in fact, they have been there for some time now, sometimes in uncomfortably large numbers; without doubt, they are also thwarting some of the best laid plans of the most conscientious teachers.[2] Education at the college level is confronted with the need of improving the reading skills of students so that they will be able to meet successfully the requirements laid upon them.[3]

College professors like other adults throughout the country are bewildered by the lack of reading ability of the college student. Each professor has reasons as to why this inadequacy exists. As usual, the blame is placed on the lower echelons and progressive or modern education. The college student, the object of the furor, does not seem as confused as the instructors. Often he thinks it would be advantageous if he could read better but other than a verbalization to that effect most college students do little or nothing.

In view of these quantitative circumstances, group training for

---

[1] Ibid., p. 18.

[2] Allen M. Pitkanen, "Inadequate Readers in the Classroom," Clearing House, XXXV (May, 1961), pp. 557-561.

[3] Frederick L. Westover and William F. Anderson, "A Reading Improvement Course at the University of Alabama," School and Society, LLIII (April, 1956), pp. 152-153.

reading improvement becomes imperative — the collegiate educational process has now truly taken on the aspects of a mass enterprise in many ways. It will not suffice merely to shrug off the burden by blandly asserting that many of those who matriculate "just don't belong in college," that they are not "college material." Instead, it must be realized that a considerable number of these young people have not had the necessary training or have not assimilated it adequately, that they have been, at least in some respects, slow to mature. To be sure, they are in some ways incompetent to carry a regular college program, but first-hand reading courses will enable a good many of them to become capable students.

These capable students are more precisely designated "mature readers" and are the kind colleges are eager to develop. Gray, in discussing "Nature of Mature Reading" in a report at the Conference on Reading - University of Chicago, 1954 - says:

> Mature as used here means: a combination of traits that make for full, rich, and efficient living with abundant capacity for on-going development. Witty in attempting to obtain maturity in readers focuses on: clear grasp of meaning and speed of reading. Witty identifies the efficient reader as: he reads for a purpose; he has a wide meaning vocabulary; he reads in thought units; he evaluates what he reads; he reads widely and enjoys reading; he reads many types of material; he adjusts his speed of reading to the kind of material read.[1]

In 1951 proceedings of this conference agreed that the mature reader has these characteristics: (1) He perceives words quickly, accurately, and independently; (2) He secures a clear grasp of the meaning of what he reads, not only literal meaning but also implied meanings and ability

---

[1]Oscar S. Causey, Exploring the Goals of College Reading Programs (Fort Worth, Texas: Texas Christian University Press, 1956), pp. 59-64.

to make generalizations; (3) He reacts thoughtfully to what he reads; (4) ...the efficient reader integrates the ideas acquired through reading with previous experiences so that wrong concepts are corrected, new insights are acquired, broader interest and rational attitude are developed, and a richer more stable personality is acquired.[1]

The degree to which a person will achieve the elements of maturity outlined here depends upon many things. In any large group there is a wide range of individual differences in every factor affecting reading proficiency. Intellectual level places a definite limit upon reading capacity. Among other factors which influence achievement in reading are: personal adjustment of the individual, the kind of reading instruction he received in school or after, his early home environment, and the availability of reading materials.[2]

A concept, prevalent a number of years ago, that formal reading instruction should terminate at the end of the intermediate grades, is changing. Today most educational leaders believe that some guidance in reading should extend through college and later years. The 47th Yearbook Committee of the National Society for the Study of Education expressed this point of view:

> Competence in reading, as in all other intellectual activities, is the product of continuous growth and careful guidance throughout school and college years, and even later.[3]

The above would seem to be conclusive proof that anyone who is

---

[1] Ibid., p. 57.

[2] Miles A. Tinker and Constance McCullough, Teaching Elementary Reading (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1962).

[3] Reading in High School and College: Forty-Seventh Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948), p. 31.

engaged in education, whether at the elementary, the secondary, or the college level, has a moral obligation to discharge - he must offer expert guidance to his students as they seek to acquire the mature aspects of the art or skill in reading.

While there are a few investigations which have challenged the value of college reading instruction, there are a great many which have given evidence to the worthwhileness of this training. One of the most carefully planned experiments is that reported by McDonald who compared groups of students who had taken the reading course at Cornell University with matched groups who had not taken reading training.[1] McDonald found that students who had taken the reading instruction had higher grade point averages than his control group and were less likely to drop out of college than were either the controls of their classmates not involved in the experiment. A somewhat similar advantage in favor of the reading-trained students was reported at New Mexico College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts by Willey and Thomson, who demonstrated that freshmen who had taken the reading instruction had a significant grade point superiority over matched controls.[2]

Two studies reported in the Journal of Developmental Reading have provided evidence that improvement in reading ability has been accompanied by better performance in other academic areas. Mary Mills described a

---

[1]Arthur S. McDonald, "Influence of A College Reading Improvement Program on Academic Performance," Journal of Educational Psychology, XLVIII (March, 1957), pp. 171-181.

[2]D. S. Willey and C. W. Thomson, "Effective Reading and Grade-Point Improvement with College Freshmen," School and Society, XXCIII (April 1956), pp. 134-135.

reading program in one of the Wisconsin state colleges.[1] While Mills and her colleagues were gratified with the improved reading abilities of their students, they were even more satisfied with the improvements observed in students' writing. "With no direct instruction in writing techniques, students in the experimental (reading) classes came to write better themes and to observe more carefully the conventions of mechanics and grammar, than students in the control sections did." At St. Francis College, two professors who represented the history and education departments set up a reading course which not only increased the ability of the students to read historical context but also caused the grade point of this same group of readers to be higher than average in a course in history.[2]

Other evidence of the recognition of the importance of training in reading during college and the years after formal schooling ends can be found in the studies of the value of remedial and corrective programs and the effect of such programs on scholarship and the individual. Increased achievement in reading skill evidenced by objective test-retest gains as a result of participation in training programs was reported in the early 1940's by such authors as Dearborn and Wilking,[3] McCallister,[4] and Parry.[5]

---

[1]Mary Mills, "Reading and the Freshman English Program," Journal of Developmental Reading, IV (October, 1957), pp. 6-8.

[2]Sister M. Fridian and Sister M. Rosanna, "A Developmental Reading Experiment in a European History Class," Journal of Developmental Reading, II (Winter, 1958), pp. 3-7.

[3]Walter F. Dearborn and S. Vincent Wilking, "Improving the Reading of College Freshmen," School Review, XLIX (November, 1941), pp. 668-678.

[4]J. M. McCallister, "College Instruction in Reading," Phi Delta Kappan, XXIV (April, 1942), pp. 311-13.

[5]Douglas F. Parry, "Reading Gains in A Freshman Remedial Program at Syracuse University," Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXII (November, 1941), pp. 624-630.

Possibly to emphasize the importance of college reading programs despite evidence that all students increase their reading skill simply as a result of attending college[1] and to answer criticism of experimental design, the late 1940's and early 1950's produced many reports of improved scholastic success for participants in reading courses over students who had had no special training.[2,3,4,5,6] Similar favorable, more recent studies have been made also which indicated higher grade point averages for trained over untrained students.[7,8,9,10,11]

---

[1]Millard E. Gladfelter, "An Analysis of Reading and English Changes that Occur During the Freshman Year in College," Journal of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars, XX (July, 1945), pp. 527-543.

[2]Richard W. Kilby, "The Relation of a Remedial Reading Program to Scholastic Success in College," Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXVI (December, 1945), pp. 503-534.

[3]Mary McGann, "Improving the Scholarship of College Freshmen with Remedial Reading Instruction," Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXIX (March, 1948), pp. 183-86.

[4]Dorothy McGinnis, "Corrective Reading: A Means of Increasing Scholastic Attainment at the College Level," Journal of Educational Psychology, XLII (March, 1951), pp. 166-173.

[5]George Mouly, "A Study of the Effects of a Remedial Reading Program on Academic Grades at the College Level," Journal of Educational Psychology, XLIII (December, 1952), pp. 459-466.

[6]Robert G. Simpson, "The Reading Laboratory as a Service Unit in College," School and Society, LV (May, 1942), pp. 621-623.

[7]Walter S. Blake, Jr., "Do Probationary College Freshmen Benefit from Compulsory Study Skills and Reading Training?" Journal of Experimental Education, XXV (September, 1956), pp. 91-93.

[8]Ernest A. Jones, "A Small College Reading Program," Sixth Yearbook, Southwest Reading Conference for Colleges and Universities, (Fort Worth, Texas: Texas Christian University Press, 1957), pp. 7-15.

[9]Albert J. Kingston and Clay E. George, "The Effects of Special Reading Training Upon the Development of College Students' Reading Skills," Journal of Educational Research, L (February, 1957), pp. 471-475.

[10]Harry H. O'Bear, "Changes in the Academic Achievement of Matched Groups of Remedial Reading and Non-Remedial Reading Students at Indiana University," Studies in Education (Bloomington, Indiana: School of Education, Indiana University, 1955).

[11]Kathleen M. Ranson, "An Evaluation of Certain Aspects of the Reading and Study Program at the University of Missouri," Journal of Educational Research, XLVIII (February, 1955), pp. 443-454.

Despite higher ability test scores for a control or non-trained group in a study carried out at Cornell University,[1,2,3] not only were significant gains in reading tests and grade point averages noted for experimental or trained students, but also there were fewer dropouts in the experimental than in the control group. Hinton[4] reported a similar experience with the dropout rate at the University of Wichita. Willey and Thompson[5] also suggested that specially planned reading programs might reduce the dropout rate of college freshmen.

Reports of improvement in gains resulting from training, weakness in experimental design continues to rear its ugly head. As noted by Traxler and Townsend,[6] "Occasionally, extravagant claims have been made without much factual evidence of real, permanent improvement." However, the permanency of gains made by college subjects as measured three to thirteen months after the termination of training has been included in

---

[1]Arthur S. McDonald, "A College Reading Program and Academic Performance," Sixth Yearbook, Southwest Reading Conference for Colleges and Universities, (Fort Worth, Texas: Texas Christian University Press, 1957), pp. 44-52.

[2]Arthur S. McDonald, "The Influence of a College Reading Improvement Program on Academic Performance," Journal of Educational Psychology, XLVIII (March, 1957), pp. 171-181.

[3]Arthur S. McDonald and Walter Pauk, "Teaching College Freshmen to Read," Phi Delta Kappan, XXXVIII (December, 1956), pp. 104-109.

[4]Evelyn A. Hinton, "Dropout Rate and Academic Progress of Two Groups of Students Enrolled at the University of Wichita," Journal of Developmental Reading, IV (Summer, 1961), pp. 272-275.

[5]D. S. Willey and C. W. Thomson, "Effective Reading and Grade-Point Improvement with College Freshmen," School and Society, LXXXIII (April 14, 1956), pp. 134-135.

[6]Arthur E. Traxler and Agatha Townsend, Eight More Years of Research in Reading: Summary and Bibliography (New York: Educational Records Bureau, 1955), p. 284.

some reports, generally within the last five or ten years.[1,2,3,4,5,6] One researcher[7] found that retesting one year after completion of a reading course indicated that about half the amount of the original gains in rate and comprehension was retained. In two follow-up studies with adults,[8,9] it was reported that gains were evident from one to one-and-one-half years after training.

---

[1]Walter B. Barbe, "The Effectiveness of Work in Remedial Reading at the College Level," Journal of Educational Psychology, XLIII (April, 1952), pp. 229-237.

[2]Charles Beasley, "A Freshman Reading Program," Journal of Developmental Reading, II (Winter, 1959), pp. 23-29.

[3]John Legere and W. R. Tracey, "Reading Improvement in an Army Service School," Journal of Developmental Reading, IV (Autumn, 1960), pp. 41-46.

[4]E. C. Poulton, "British Courses for Adults on Effective Reading," British Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXI (June, 1961), pp. 128-137.

[5]Donald Smith and Roger Wood, "Reading Improvement and College Grades: A Follow-Up," Journal of Educational Psychology, XLVI (March, 1955), pp. 151-159.

[6]Eugene Sullivan, "Dissertations in College Reading: 1918 to October 1960," Journal of Developmental Reading, IV (Autumn, 1960), pp. 268-271.

[7]John W. McMillan, "Reading Improvement in Business," Fifth Yearbook, Southwest Reading Conference for Colleges and Universities, (Fort Worth, Texas: Texas Christian University Press, 1955), pp. 82-84.

[8]G. W. Kenworthy, "An Evaluation of the Results of Instruction and Practice in the Techniques of Better Reading," Journal of Developmental Reading, II (Summer, 1959), pp. 11-16.

[9]R. G. Murdick, "Problems in Developing a Profitable Reading Improvement Course for Executives," Journal of Developmental Reading, II (Spring, 1959), pp. 22-30.

Despite the accumulated data indicating that improved reading skill is reflected in higher grade point averages in college students, there are critics who point out that research predicting success in college from reading test scores has yielded contradictory results. Moderate to high correlations between reading achievement and college success have been reported.[1,2,3,4] Low or negative correlations have also been reported.[5] However, one negative correlation reported by Murphy and Davis[6] was obtained between a "reasoning ability" test score which was adapted from the Cooperative Reading Comprehension Test and grades in college. In another study by Preston and Botel which yielded low correlations,[7]

---

[1]Virginia Havens, "A Prediction of Law School Achievement from High School Rank, Reading Test Scores, Psychological Test Scores, and Average Grades in Pre-Law Courses," Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXIX (April, 1948), pp. 237-242.

[2]Walter R. Hill, "Factors Associated with Comprehension Deficiency of College Readers," Journal of Developmental Reading, III (Winter, 1960), pp. 84-93.

[3]R. Jackson, "Prediction of the Academic Success of College Freshmen," Journal of Educational Psychology, XLVI (1955), pp. 296-301.

[4]Donald Smith and Roger Wood, "Reading Improvement and College Grades: A Follow-Up," Journal of Educational Psychology, XLVI (March, 1955), pp. 151-159.

[5]R. McQueen, "Diagnostic Reading Scores and College Achievement," Psychological Reports, III (1957), pp. 627-629.

[6]Harold Murphy and Frederick Davis, "College Grades and Ability to Reason in Reading," Peabody Journal of Education, XXVII (July, 1949), pp. 34-37.

[7]Ralph Preston and Morton Botel, "The Relation of Reading Skill and Other Factors to the Academic Achievement of 2048 College Students," Journal of Experimental Education, XX (June, 1952), pp. 363-371.

the authors pointed out that reading skill is more important than the magnitude of the correlations indicated and that reading instruction yielded gains in average marks which approached statistical significance. On the other hand, in a recent paper[1] it was pointed out that the correlation between reading test scores and grade point averages was moderate but that holding intelligence and listening skill constant yielded partial correlations near zero.

The practical significance of research indicating reading improvement and the permanency of such gains is immediately apparent in that it should persuade more widespread use of improvement courses with college students. However, discussions of the characteristics of poor readers at these levels, such as those provided by McCaul,[2] Wilking,[3] and Witty, Stolarz, and Cooper,[4] should be particularly helpful to those in charge of organizing new programs of evaluating existing programs. The latter are discussed more fully in the following chapter.

---

[1]Edwin E. Vineyard and Robert Bailey, "Interrelationships of Reading Ability, Listening Skill, Intelligence, and Scholastic Achievement," Journal of Developmental Reading, III (Apring, 1960), pp. 174-178.

[2]Robert McCaul, "Student Personnel Opportunities for the College Remedial-Reading Teacher," School Review, LI (March, 1943), pp. 158-163.

[3]S. Vincent Wilking, "The Improvement of Reading Ability in College," Education, LXII (September, 1951), pp. 27-31.

[4]Paul A. Witty, Theodore Stolarz, and William Cooper, "Some Results of a Remedial Reading Program for College Students," School and Society, LXXVI (December, 1952), pp. 376-380.

CHAPTER II

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Organization and treatment of the literature.--This chapter presents a survey of the current research on college reading-improvement programs in the nation. The investigation concentrates on the (1) nature, (2) trends, (3) materials and equipment, and (4) reported results in reading programs and services for students.

More specifically, the data presented in this chapter are organized around the following areas of concern as stated in the purposes of the study:

(a) The presence or absence of a formal reading program

(b) Provisions for "slow," "average," and "able" readers

(c) The screening process used to detect students in need of special help in reading

(d) The extent of the testing program

(e) Provisions and policies for termination of training

(f) The department in which the reading classes or services are placed

(g) The designation as a requirement or as a part of an orientation program.

Introductory statement.--The writer felt the need to qualify his presentation of materials. There was an apparent sparsity of research in reading; especially, on program organizations and particulars, in general. The literature strongly convinced him that there was an urgent need for

research on individual programs yielding completeness for this type analysis. The literature further substantiated the fact that the majority of the attempts had been to explain the methods and materials used to achieve student improvement in reading.

Consequently, as each of the stated purposes is discussed - the brevity of many of the sections was due to the incompleteness of the literature.

The presence or absence of a formal reading program.--Some evidence of the degree of professional concern with reading at the college level can be obtained from questionnaire studies of the extent of provision for reading improvement courses offered by colleges and universities. At least four such studies[1,2,3,4] of the status and practices of remedial and corrective reading programs in junior colleges and colleges were published before 1942. The per cent of responding institutions reporting the existence of such programs ranged from 32 to 61. By 1951, Barbe[5] reported that about 75 per cent of the institutions surveyed offered remedial help in reading and about half of these indicated that their programs

---

[1]W. W. Charters, "Remedial Reading in College," Journal of Higher Education, XII (March, 1941), pp. 117-121.

[2]Frances P. Triggs, "Remedial Reading Programs: Evidence of Their Development," Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXIII (December, 1942), pp. 678-685.

[3]Paul A. Witty, "Practices in Corrective Reading in Colleges and Universities," School and Society, LII (November, 1940), pp. 564-568.

[4]Joseph E. Zerga, "Remedial Reading Programs," Junior College Journal, XI (December, 1940), pp. 194-195.

[5]Walter Barbe, "Reading-Improvement Services in Colleges and Universities," School and Society, LXXVI (July, 1951), pp. 6-7.

had not been in operation before 1946. A survey of colleges and universities during the period of 1954-55 revealed that about 73 per cent reported reading courses in progress.[1]

During the 1950's, hundreds of American colleges provided reading-improvement programs and enrolled thousands of students in them. By 1956, it was evident from six surveys of college reading programs reported in the yearbooks (1954-59) of the National Reading Conference for Colleges and Adults that almost three-fourths of the 418 institutions replying to questionnaires reported reading programs in progress.[2] This study also reported a total enrollment of 57,052 students, as compared with 33,341 students noted in a survey made the previous year. In 1959, Miller summarized a total of 233 responses to questionnaires representing the returns from 372 colleges that had reported reading programs in 1955:

> In terms of growth of programs in the last five years, 49 schools indicated that their programs had more than doubled, 67 indicated that they had had moderate increases, 34 indicated no increase at all, 20 indicated that they were limited by college policy and would not grow, and 2 indicated that they were unable to tell about growth.[3]

The surveys made portrayed a considerable development of reading programs at the college level during the 1950's. But, it was evident that, during that decade, numerous colleges failed to provide any reading programs even though it had been quite well established that practically

---

[1]Oscar S. Causey, "College Reading Programs in the Nation," Fifth Yearbook, Southwest Reading Conference, (Fort Worth, Texas: The Texas University Press, 1955), pp. 135-137.

[2]Yearbooks of the National Reading Conference for Colleges and Adults (Prior to 1956, Southwest Reading Conference for Colleges and Universities), (Fort Worth, Teaxs: Texas Christian University Press, 1954-59).

[3]Lyle L. Miller, "Current Use of Workbooks and Mechanical Aids," Eighth Yearbook, National Reading Conference for Colleges and Adults, (Fort Worth, Texas: Texas Christian University Press, 1959), p. 67.

all college students can increase their reading efficiency through instruction.

Today, most colleges and universities offer to their students, particularly to their freshmen, some type of reading improvement course. Such programs may or may not carry credit, may or may not be voluntary, and may or may not employ reading machines and devices. Regardless of such differences, however, most of the reading improvement programs have one thing in common - their aim is primarily to help the college student to improve his reading skills, speed, and comprehension so as to minimize academic failures and to maximize the benefits that a student receives from his courses and his outside reading.[1]

Provisions for "slow," "average," and "able" readers.--Barbe,[2] Blake,[3] and Pellettieri[4] indicated in their extensive surveys that college reading programs were made available to, or were taken advantage of by, only a small proportion of the college population. Barbe found that schools gave assistance to from 25 to 1,200 students a year, with the average number being a little over 300.[5] With the increasing emphasis that has been given to college reading programs in the last few days, it would seem rather likely that a greater number of students are being serviced - although recent questionnaire data, obtained by Causey from state universi-

---

[1]Barbara A. Beecher, "Reading Improvement and Psychological Orientation," Journal of Developmental Reading, IV (Winter, 1962), p. 133.

[2]Barbe, loc. cit., pp. 607.

[3]Walter S. Blake, "College Level Study Skills Program - Some Observations," Junior College Journal, XXV (November, 1954), pp. 148-150.

[4]A. J. Pellettieri, "Reading Programs for Adults," Third Yearbook, Southwest Reading Conference for Colleges and Universities, (Fort Worth, Texas: University Press, 1954), pp. 87-90.

[5]Barbe, loc. cit., pp. 6-7.

ties and large private institutions and analyzed by Pellettieri, revealed enrollments in reading courses of from 14 to 500 students per semester.[1]

On the basis of a questionnaire sent to all the colleges in Pennsylvania, Colvin[2] gave some recommendations concerning college developmental reading programs. These recommendations were: "(1) means should be sought to make reading and study instruction available to ... the better readers ..., and (2) more evaluative studies should be made to ascertain the effectiveness of reading instruction in general..." Dotson[3] described a method of grouping students for college reading classes. This method is based on reading rate and per cent of comprehension. Four groups were described. Unfortunately, no data was given in order that a comparison of gains could be made. In a study designed to "select the most efficient method for enrolling students who could profit by an 'Improvement of Reading Skills' course," Scott[4] suggested two criteria: "(1) potentiality to gain calculated by the difference shown between present attainment (defined as grade placement on a standardized reading test) and norms for grade attainment in relation to the intelligence quotient medians, and (2) students estimated as having high motivation are enrolled in the course upon recommendation of their adviser." Jones'[5] report

---

[1]Pellettieri, loc. cit., pp. 87-90.

[2]Charles R. Colvin, "What is Being Done in College Reading Programs in Pennsylvania," Journal of Developmental Reading, V (Autumn, 1961), p. 72.

[3]Elsie Dotson, "Grouping in Remedial Reading," Third Yearbook, Southwest Reading Conference for Colleges and Universities, (Fort Worth, Texas: The Texas University Press, 1954), pp. 106-107.

[4]Frances D. Scott, "Evaluation of a College Reading Program," Journal of Developmental Reading, II (Autumn, 1958), p. 40.

[5]Ernest A. Jones, "A Small College Reading Program," Sixth Yearbook, Southwest Reading Conference for Colleges and Universities, (Fort Worth, Texas: The Texas University Press, 1957), pp. 7-15.

supported the findings of Scott.

The screening process used to detect students in need of special help in reading.--In the course of their analysis of objectives, McDonald and Byrne set forth a list of factors which served them to differentiate the aims of college reading-improvement programs. One of these was the selection procedures used:[1]

> In the matter of student population, for example, College A requires all freshmen to take a reading-improvement course. But University B selects for reading training only those who fall below a certain grade on the entrance tests; this grade may refer to vocabulary proficiency, quality of comprehension, speed in covering a given passage or passages--or a combination score which takes all these elements or others into account for the final evaluation. Again, State Colleges C, D, and E require no student to take the reading course, but the entire student body is welcome to elect the program at any particular semester during the first, second, or third and fourth year. Metropolitan University F has developed a referral system, whereby students who show marked deficiency in their grades in composition, literature, history, science, or other courses are admitted to special classes where extensive drills are offered in speeding up reading, in improving comprehension, in developing vocabulary, in fostering flexibility of attack upon several different reading problems. And Private University G requires all liberal arts and science majors to take an extensive reading course, but permits registrants in the schools of pharmacy, dentistry, agriculture, home economics, engineering, and medicine to elect the course. Nor do these permutations exhaust the possibilities -- many more combinations of circumstances have already been devised or will be adopted to suit individual needs and opportunities at colleges and universities which might be designated from H to Q or even to Y and Z.

From the replies to a detailed questionnaire returned by representatives of colleges and universities in Pennsylvania, Colvin[2] recently described the "ideal" college reading program. As early as 1940 there was evidence that administrators felt that reading should be a part of

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 50-51.

[2] Ibid., p. 72.

all curriculum[1] and in Colvin's ideal program all freshmen would be required to take a reading course of an appropriate level. There is evidence of improved reading skill as a result of a required reading program,[2] and regardless of the original level of reading achievement, freshmen appear to profit from a plan to include reading training in all required English courses.[3] On the other hand, Feinberg, Long, and Rosencheck[4] refute the advisability of mandatory special reading programs.

The extent of the testing program.--In order to evaluate achievement which results from a reading program, it is, of course, necessary to have some description of the performance level of the readers before the instruction is given. Here again practices among colleges and universities differed from those employed by other adult programs. With the widespread use of the pre-college testing programs, university and college admission offices commonly have one or two measures of the reading ability of each student several weeks or months before he arrives on campus. Those colleges which assemble their own batteries of entrance examinations also included one or two tests of reading skill, as a general rule. Inasmuch as colleges are concerned mainly with measuring the ability to read academic materials effectively the reading tests administered to prospective freshmen usually feature the comprehension of textbook-like

---

[1]Joseph E. Zerga, "Remedial Reading Programs," Junior College Journal, XI (December, 1940), pp. 194-195.

[2]Maurice A. Lee, "Results of a College All-Freshman Reading Improvement Program," Journal of Developmental Reading, II (Autumn, 1958), pp. 20-32.

[3]Mary Mills, "Reading and the Freshman English Program," Journal of Developmental Reading, I (Autumn, 1957), pp. 3-6.

[4]Mortimer Feinberg, L. Long, and V. Rosencheck, "Results of a Mandatory Study Course for Entering Freshmen," Journal of Developmental Reading, V (Winter, 1962), pp. 95-100.

passages ranging up to several hundred words in length; speed of reading may be measured, but it is not often treated as though it is asimportant as the sort of comprehension measured by the "Davis Reading Test,"[1] "Cooperative English Test, C2,"[2] or the reading section of the "American College Test."[3] Generally, some measure of vocabulary is included either as a separate test or as a sub-test in reading.

Customarily, a reading survey measure is given to either college or non-college adult trainees as part of the first or second instructional session. A perusal of the literature suggests that the "Survey Section, Diagnostic Reading Test"[4] has replaced the "Iowa Silent Reading Test"[5] as the most widely used pre-instruction measure of reading status, although the latter test is still used in a surprising number of programs in spite of its antiquity. In addition to the survey test, many college-adult reading programs include beginning trainees to evaluate themselves as readers, usually by responding to a stock set of questions. Such evaluation is, quite naturally, highly subjected in most instances and involves the student's appraisals of their attitudes and interests as much or more than

---

[1]"Davis Reading Test," (New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1958).

[2]"Cooperative English Test, C2, Reading Comprehension," (Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1940-1953).

[3]"American College Test," (Iowa City, Iowa: American College Testing Program, 1959).

[4]"Diagnostic Reading Test," (Mountain Home, North Carolina: Committee on Diagnostic Reading Test, 1947).

[5]"Iowa Silent Reading Test," (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1943).

of their abilities. The trainee self-evaluation then are interpreted subjectively by the instructional staff. After a few years of dissatisfaction with the subjectivity, and consequent inaccuracy, of the conventional type of self-evaluation, Raygor and his collegues,[1,2] at Minnesota began to convert a pool of several hundred self-evaluation statements into an instrument which could be used to reveal reading disability syndromes. Included were statements such as: "I comprehend slowly when reading rapidly," "I seldom finish what I plan to do," "I read more than I used to." The resulting "Diagnostic Reading Inventory" has been subjected to assorted statistical procedures in an attempt to extract from it a number of scales which will identify different types of criterion groups of readers, such as students who are overconcerned about their reading, or rigid, compulsive readers who seem to experience difficulty in changing their reading patterns.

While a reading survey test, and a self-evaluation may be customary appraisal procedures at the beginning of college-adult reading instruction, there are many other evaluational devices employed to gauge readers before instruction begins. Various measures of personality, visual screening tests and eye movement photographs are not uncommon in the arrays of pre-instruction evaluation procedures. If the counselling program is administratively close to the reading instruction, an individual interview of all

---

[1]Alton Raygor, E. V. Vance, and Donna Adcock, "The Diagnosis and Treatment of College Reading Difficulties Using Patterns of Symptomatic Statements," Journal of Developmental Reading, III (Autumn, 1959), pp. 3-10.

[2]Alton Raygor, "Measurement in Reading," Tenth Yearbook, National Reading Conference, (Milwaukee: National Reading Conference, 1961), pp. 108-112.

or some students may contribute to the evaluation process. Pre-testing in college programs has at times included measures of any of a multitude of social, emotional, cultural and educational factors. Smith and his staff at Michigan,[1] McDonald and his aides at Marquette,[2] and Rankin at Texas Christian[3,4] have been particularly active in the identification of psychological characteristics of beginning reading trainees, while Hill[5] sought to evaluate a variety of social, cultural, experiential and personality factors as they related to reading ability prior to college instruction. Hill's measures ranged from "Warner's Revised Scale" (parental occupation)[6] to the "MMPI"[7].

In those colleges which provide a clinical program for their seriously retarded student readers some sort of detailed diagnostic evaluation is needed. Until very recently no such diagnostic instruments were available, for while the "Diagnostic Reading Test" in its various booklets provides a great deal of detail, it does not reveal the sort of diagnostic

---

[1]Donald Smith, R. L. Wood, J. W. Downer and A. L. Raygor, "Reading Improvement as a Function of Student Personality and Teaching Method," Journal of Educational Psychology, XLVII (1956), pp. 47-59.

[2]Arthur McDonald, S. Edwin, James Byrne, "Reading Deficiencies and Personality Factors: A Comprehensive Treatment," Eighth Yearbook, National Reading Conference, (Milwaukee: National Reading Conference, 1959), pp. 89-98.

[3]Earl Rankin, Jr., "Reading Test Reliability and Validity as a Function of Introversion-Extroversion," Journal of Developmental Reading, (Winter, 1963), pp. 106-117.

[4]Earl F. Rankin, Jr., "Reading Test Performances of Introverts and Extroverts," Twelfth Yearbook of the National Reading Conference, (in press).

[5]Walter R. Hill, "Factors Associated with Comprehension Deficiency of College Readers," Journal of Developmental Reading, III (Winter, 1959), pp. 84-93.

[6]W. L. Warner, Marcia Meeker, and Kenneth Eells, Social Class in America (Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1949).

[7]"Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory," (New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1943).

data available at lower grade levels from the "Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty,"[1] or the "Gates Reading Diagnostic Test."[2] In 1963, the Spache "Diagnostic Reading Scales"[3] appeared, and according to the examiner's manual these scales are appropriate for use with college students. Another recent test which is described by the publisher as suitable for diagnostic use with college students is the "McCullough Word Analysis Test."[4] Both the Spache and McCullough tests are too new to be represented extensively in the literature; thus, no accounts of their use at college-adult levels can be reported herein.

Provisions and policies for termination of training.--McDonald and Byrne report that as to length of programs, the semester would seem to be the customary term, though many institutions offer four, eight, or twelve weeks of intensive study in particular units of work, such as practice for the improvement of comprehension, rate, vocabulary, or flexibility of approach. Moreover, duration of training is often determined by personal progress; for instance, if Student Green can accomplish certain results as evidenced by tests and quizzes, he may be released from his obligations to attend reading sessions within a very few weeks. But Student Gray may spend from sixteen to thirty weeks to secure the same proficiency.[5]

---

[1] "Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty," (New York: Harcourt, Grace and World, 1955).

[2] "Gates Reading Diagnostic Test," (New York: Teachers College, Bureau of Publications, 1945).

[3] "Diagnostic Reading Scales," (Monterey, California: California Test Bureau, 1963).

[4] "McCullough Word-Analysis Tests," (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1962).

[5] Arthur McDonald and James Byrne, "Four Questions on Objectives," Journal of Developmental Reading, I (Spring, 1958), pp. 46-51.

Causey, from his survey, reports that the length of courses was reported as follows:[1]

> More than eighteen weeks 16, eighteen weeks 99, sixteen weeks 67, twelve weeks 70, ten weeks 29, nine weeks, 10, less than nine weeks 54, not reported 73.

There is great variation in the length of courses offered by various schools and in the types of practice material used as found by Barbe[2] and Pellettieri.[3]

The department in which the reading classes or services are placed.--Reading programs, as they have developed and are developing in American colleges and universities today, seem to fall into the following general categories:

1. The English-reading class pattern. In this pattern English instructors assume the chief responsibility for improving reading skills, usually of freshmen.
2. The communication arts pattern. In this pattern, the improvement is an integral part of a basic course required of all students.
3. The orientation pattern. The orientation programs of some schools are quite elaborate and detailed, including improvement of basic reading skills, use of the library, etc.
4. The reading clinic, or laboratory pattern. In a number of colleges and universities the reading clinic, or reading laboratory, serves the needs of the school through both group and individual services.[4]

Ziemann made a study of 85 selected schools with respect to their "communication" courses. The course in each of the schools involved at least speaking and two other communication arts. Ziemann found, among

---

[1]Oscar S. Causey, "College Reading Programs In the Nation," Fifth Yearbook, Southwest Reading Conference for Colleges and Universities, (Fort Worth, Texas: Texas Christian University Press, 1956), pp. 136-137.

[2]Barbe, loc. cit., pp. 607.

[3]Pellettieri, loc. cit., pp. 87-90.

[4]Dorothy K. Bracken, "Problems Involved," Fourth Yearbook, Southwest Reading Conference, (Fort Worth, Texas: The Texas University Press, 1955), pp. 81-82.

a number of other things, that English Departments were usually in charge, that English and speech instructors taught most of the courses, that courses were usually a year in length, that reading and writing received more emphasis than listening and speaking, that several books (rather than one book) were used as texts for the course, and that such courses were usually offered during the freshman year.[1]

According to Causey,[2] the departments responsible for instruction in the courses were reported as follows:

> English 126, Education 122, Psychology 48, Reading Clinic 21, Communications 10, Humanities 5, not named, 86.

The designation as a requirement or as a part of an orientation program.--Causey indicated in his survey that the titles of courses were reported as follows: Reading Improvement 221, Developmental Reading 66, English 54, Reading Laboratory 51, not given 34. He further noted that credit allowed for these courses was as follows: five hours 4, three hours 42, two hours 48, one hour 48, no credit 132, not reported 144.[3]

McDonald and Byrne stated regarding the granting of credit that the solution seems to be relatively simple - credit is given or denied. But the total amount of credit awarded for successful completion of the training varies from one to three hours; the actual number of hours spent in the reading center is usually the determinant for extent of credit. Furthermore, non-credit courses differ in several respects. Some are required,

---

[1] Norman C. Zieman, "A Study of the Communication Courses in Selected Colleges and Universities in the United States," Dissertation Abstracts 21:2828-2829, March, 1961.

[2] Causey, loc. cit., pp. 136-137.

[3] Ibid.

and the student must achieve a satisfactory rating to avoid repeating the training. Other non-credit plans are voluntary and permit the registrant to perform or participate as he wishes without any relationship to his accomplishments or his failure to demonstrate progress.[1]

Barbe,[2] Pellettieri[3] and Kingston[4] also reported that survey data also indicated that a majority of schools do not give credit for work in reading improvement courses.

Methods and materials.--Turning to the content of and the materials stressed in college reading programs one might suspect that it would be necessary to devote a quite lengthy discussion to this topic. However, a survey of the literature suggested, in essence, that college programs are very similar, and that on the whole they are rate-oriented and machine-centered.

For instance, in a survey of 21 Junior Colleges 100 per cent of the respondents indicated their program included individual instruction in reading. But further study of the data revealed that the individual work referred to was incorporated in the use of such materials as tachistoscopic drill, reading accelerators, teaching films, and the reading of workbooks or manuals.[5]

---

[1]McDonald and Byrne, loc. cit., pp. 89-98.

[2]Barbe, loc. cit., pp. 6-7.

[3]Pellettieri, loc. cit., pp. 87-90.

[4]Albert Kingston, "Analysis of Reading Questionnaire for Texas Society for College Teachers of Education," Third Yearbook, Southwest Reading Conference for Colleges and Universities, (Fort Worth, Texas: The Texas University Press, 1954), pp. 67-70.

[5]Wade Andrews, "Junior College Reading Programs: Goals and Techniques," Fifth Yearbook, Southwest Reading Conference for Colleges and Universities, (Fort Worth, Texas: The Texas University Press, 1957), pp. 102-103.

In a survey of college programs reported in the Seventh Yearbook, the author found it necessary to devote almost two printed pages to simply listing mechanical aids and "packaged" reading programs which relied heavily on such aids. In regard to the factor he wrote: "As lengthy as this array may be - it is by no means exhaustive - anyone entering the field (college reading) is faced with a formidable array of mechanical devices."[1]

The Eighth Yearbook contains a discussion of the use of workbooks and mechanical aids in college programs. Data are cited for 214 respondents as to their use of ten different mechanical devices. These were checked 310 times as being used for motivational purposes and 306 times as being used for training. Undoubtedly, there is some overlap in these two categories and the data are cited here as being suggestive of the extent to which mechanical devices are used in college programs.[2]

Acker[3] reported that a survey of 177 adult reading programs showed most programs emphasizing mechanics of reading. Two-thirds of the programs were voluntary and 60 per cent of the agencies used group instructional methods, 30 per cent combining this with individual instruction.

Miller[4] made a survey of 233 college programs in 1957 and found that

---

[1]Edmund N. Fulker, "A Decade of Progress in College and Adult Reading Improvement," Seventh Yearbook, National Reading Conference for Colleges and Adults, (Fort Worth, Texas: Texas Christian University Press, 1958), p. 17.

[2]Lyle L. Miller, "Current Use of Workbooks and Mechanical Aids," Eighth Yearbook, Southwest Reading Conference for Colleges and Universities, (Fort Worth, Texas: Texas Christian University Press, 1959), pp. 67-75.

[3]Ralph S. Acker, "Reading Improvement in Government and Business," Education, LXXXII (March, 1962), pp. 428-431.

[4]Lyle L. Miller, "Evaluation of Workbooks for College Reading Programs," Sixth Yearbook, Southwest Reading Conference for Colleges and Adults, (Fort Worth, Texas: Texas Christian University Press, 1957), pp. 75-85.

by far the most popular method of instruction was through group procedures. Ninety-six of the groups studied used workbooks for whole-group practice with mechanical aids, supplemented by individual practice in workbooks. Forty-six institutions utilized a group program but used both workbooks and mechanicals aids individually, with no common practice for the entire group.

Although these various methods of program organization represent major basic patterns, they of course cannot be wholly representative of the many combinations which have grown out of them. Universities and colleges offer programs modified and tailored to the needs and purposes of their selected audiences. It may be reasonably concluded that methods of organization currently remain in a very fluid and experimental state.

Research culminating in collections of workbook and textbook materials for college reading lagged behind the period when programs were beginning to develop. Although Louella Cole Pressey published a Manual of Reading Exercises for Freshmen as early as 1928, few other instructional materials appeared on the market before 1950. In 1941, an analysis of fourteen years of prior manual publication was made by Laycock and Russell.[1] They found that "the manuals analyzed revealed a lack of research references on specific problems of study and much disagreement regarding the most effective study habits and skills ... and that few of them had any basis in research findings for their suggestions regarding the improvement of study methods." Harvey Robinson, in a review of remedial texts at the college level as late as 1950 stated:

---

[1]Samuel R. Laycock and David H. Russell, "An Analysis of Thirty-eight How-to-Study Manuals," The School Review, XLIX (May, 1941), pp. 370-379.

> No particular professional acuity is required to penetrate the superficiality of types of exercises and treatments which characterize most of these volumes.[1]

Further, according to Robinson, these materials were overly concerned with reading speed, contained no well-rounded index of comprehension, and indicated an absence of exercises to develop basic organizational skills. Because of these limitations, many instructors began to experiment in their own programs and by 1954 there was a rush of publications appearing for laboratory and clinic use. Of the thirty-three manuals and workbooks reviewed by Miller[2] in 1957, twenty-seven of them had been published in the first half of the 1950's. One third of these workbooks contained five or more types of exercises, including word meaning and vocabulary, phrase and sentence meaning, skimming or idea reading, exploratory reading, and critical or analytical reading.

Bliesmer,[3] writing in 1959, stated that these materials continue to appear in increasing numbers and indicate a trend toward emphasis on a variety, rather than a very small or narrow, number of reading skills. When one considers that the studies by Holmes[4,5] not all of the factors of rate and comprehension could be accounted for in fifty-four separate

---

[1]H. A. Robinson, "A Note on the Evaluation of College Remedial Reading Courses," Journal of Educational Psychology, XLI (February, 1950), pp. 83-96.

[2]Miller, loc. cit.

[3]Emery P. Bliesmer, "Future Practices in Reading Instruction in Adult Programs," Reading in a Changing Society, IV (May, 1959), pp. 120-123.

[4]Jack Holmes, "Factors Underlying Major Disabilities at the College Level," Genetic Psychology Monographs, XLIX (1954), pp. 3-95.

[5]Jack Holmes, "Personality Characteristics of the Disabled Reader," The Journal of Developmental Reading, IV (Winter, 1961), pp. 111-122.

tests, then obviously a multi-factor approach to reading is quite necessary.

Workbooks made up an important part of the programs being offered. In a survey by Causey,[1] published in 1960, 88 per cent of the more than five hundred college programs then in existence used workbooks as an integral part of their materials.

In 1960, Acker[2] reported from a study of 177 programs that textbooks and workbooks were emphasized more than any other single type of equipment or material, with a concomitant decrease in the use of mechanical equipment. As Miller's[3] review showed, by far the most popular basic training materials aid was the workbook supplemented by individual practice with mechanical aids. Eller speaking to the National Reading Conference in 1959, stated:

> It is distinctly possible to have a high grade reading course with workbooks, other printed reading materials, and a few tests and student record materials.[4]

Probably the most controversial tools found in college and adult programs are the mechanical devices used to improve reading rate. Stanford Taylor,[5] writing for The Reading Teacher in May of 1962, offers a very thorough description of the instruments currently in use. He discusses tachistoscopic devices, directional attack control techniques, the

---

[1]Oscar S. Causey, "A Decade of Progress in Colleges," Education, LXXX (May, 1960), pp. 549-551.

[2]Ralph S. Acker, "Reading Improvement in Military, Government, and Business Agencies," The Reading Teacher, XIV (November, 1960), pp. 89-92.

[3]Miller, loc. cit.

[4]William Eller, "Starting a College Reading Program," Eighth Yearbook, National Reading Conference, (Fort Worth, Texas: Texas Christian University Press, 1959), pp. 9-14.

[5]Stanford E. Taylor, "Reading Instrument Usage," The Reading Teacher, XV (May, 1962), pp. 449-454.

accelerating devices, and the skimming and scanning instruments.

Much interest has been maintained over the past three decades in regard to the value of improving visual performance in reading through use of these mechanical aids. A report of the Research Division of the National Education Association as early as 1935 said:

> Whenever faulty eye-movement habits are discovered, teachers should regard them as symptoms of some fundamental difficulty - not as causes of poor reading. They are to be eliminated by finding and correcting the real difficulty not by attempting to pace the eye-movements as some have attempted to do.[1]

Miles A. Tinker,[2] a pioneer in eye-movement studies, wrote in School and Society in 1934 that there is a lack of evidence that training eye-movements, as such, develops effective habits which improve reading ability; and Buswell,[3] from an experimental study of reading improvement at the college level, reported in 1939 that training eye-movements does not increase reading ability. But research studies on this question are still very much in evidence. For example, Thompson[4] reported in 1956 a seven-week experiment with adult groups which were divided into workbook sections and machine-centered sections. Results indicated that in comprehension and flexibility, no significant differences were found relative to materials of instruction. Measures of rate of reading indicated that the

---

[1] Research Division of the National Education Association, "Better Reading Instruction," Research Bulletin No. 13, (November, 1935), p. 299.

[2] Miles A. Tinker, "The Role of Eye Movements in Diagnostic and Remedial Reading," School and Society, XXXIX (February, 1934), pp. 147-148.

[3] Guy Thomas Buswell, "Remedial Reading at the College and Adult Levels: An Experimental Study," Recent Treands in Reading, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939), p. 12.

[4] Warren Craig Thompson, "A Book-centered Course Versus a Machine-centered Course in Adult Reading Improvement," Journal of Educational Reasearch, XLIX (February, 1956), pp. 437-445.

workbook-centered reading instruction in the twenty-one hour courses resulted in reading rates that were significantly higher than rates attained by machine-centered instruction.

Many of these later studies have been reviewed and summarized by Spache, Karlin, and Gates. Spache, reviewing the earlier summaries by Traxler and Tinker of 1943 and 1946, respectively, and also the literature up to 1958, concluded that:

> We have found little evidence that various mechanical devices produce a greater improvement in rate of reading than other approaches. Training intended to modify eye-movement characteristics such as regression, duration of fixation, perceptual span, or number of fixations is highly questionable. These eye-movement characteristics may not be amenable to training since they, like reading success, are significantly determined by the nature of the reading material and attributes of the reader.[1]

However, according to Spache, it is not appropriate to dismiss mechanical training devices as insignificant. He suggested that mechanical training is successful in that in effect the student "is being taught to read with fewer cues, to guess more readily what he sees peripherally, to overcome the caution exhibited in slow or word-by-word reading, and to be more confident in dealing with vague or indistinct portions of words."[2]

Reviewing the research relating to machines and reading in both college and adult level programs, Karlin reported in 1958 that:

> Outcomes in speed or reading similar to those achieved

---

[1]George D. Spache, "A Rationale for Mechanical Methods of Improving Reading," Seventh Yearbook, National Reading Conference for Colleges and Adults, (Fort Worth, Texas: Texas Christian University Press, 1958), p. 125.

[2]Ibid., p. 125.

> through the use of special instruments may be expected through suitable reading instruction which does not include these same instruments.[1]

After a study of observed eye movements of selected readers and a study of the various reading machines used to improve visual attack, Gates wrote:

> A superior type of reading is thwarted at every turn by these controlled exposures. ...This thwarting may have results that are seriously disadvantageous.[2]

Yet reading instruments have a very permanent place in reading improvement programs. Taylor[3] listed responses from 777 International Reading Association members in 1962 which indicated that 59 per cent used one or more types of reading instrument. Miller's[4] survey found that the second most popular pattern of material usage, followed by fifty-one institutions of his sampling, was one of basic group practice with mechanical aids supplemented by individual practice in workbooks. Forty-six of the colleges reported using both mechanical aids and workbooks for individual practice.

Several "package" or ready-developed programs are available which present a variety of activities purporting to developing reading skills. For example, the Perceptual Development Laboratories of St. Louis, Missouri market such a program, including a multi-function projector, training films, and associated workbooks and practice lessons. Educational Developmental

---

[1]Robert Karlin, "Machines and Reading: A Review of Research," Clearing House, XXXII (February, 1958), p. 352.

[2]Arthur I. Gates, "Teaching Machines in Perspective," Elementary School Journal, LXII (October, 1961), p. 6.

[3]Taylor, loc. cit.

[4]Miller, loc. cit.

Laboratories of Huntington, New York have available several organized instructional offerings, including the "Reading 400 Auto-Instructional Reading Program," and the "Listen-Read Program." Science Research Associates of Chicago produce the multi-level Reading Laboratories, and Columbia University and the Reading Laboratory, a private corporation of New York and Philadelphia, also have available auto-instructional programs for the college subscriber.

These programs are convenient to use and seem to offer the instructor or individual student a ready-made recipe for the best in instructional format and design. On the other hand, Causey commented in the May, 1960 issue of Education:

> Since the effectiveness of procedures may vary from group to group, the necessity for frequent evaluation of procedures by the instructor becomes evident. In a good reading program, the instructor adopts practices and measuring procedures designed to develop the different skills and avoids the use of the so-called pakage deals.[1]

Conclusions.--Summarizing the literature on the present use of methods and materials in the college program, instructional techniques are selected to include the broadened objectives of vocabulary building, diversified reading and comprehension, flexibility, better writing, speaking and listening, and better management of time, in addition to the improvement of rate, which was the sole purpose of many of the earlier programs. There has been a marked trend away from the indiscriminate use of mechanical aids toward materials to fit individual needs. Training personnel now ask, "Where can we get a good instructor?" rather than "What

---

[1] Oscar S. Causey, "A Decade of Progress in Colleges," Education, LXXX (May, 1960), pp. 549-551.

equipment should we buy?"[1]

If particular emphases on selection of college level methods and materials were to be singled out, they would include those that place emphasis on the development of purpose of flexibility in reading, maintain a high level of transfer value to the content area, relate to the significance of personality factors in reading difficulties, and introduce opportunities for learning skills of critical and creative reading. These basic elements of reading maturity find expression in many research studies and programs. For example, after an intensive study of eight years of experimental programs at DePaul University, Halfter and Douglass[2] concluded that those programs which correlated significantly with college grades were those which emphasized major patterns of organizing and developing thinking in each content field. Shaw[3] lists of major importance those skills of skimming and scanning for the identification of the author's purposes, main ideas, and scope of subject matter.

Ideally, the research suggests that the selection of methods and materials for a program of reading improvement should be based on the needs of the individual. While it is true that for the instructor with large college groups complete individualization is relatively impossible, face validity should at least be kept in mind when planning methods or selecting materials. Matching materials and methods to a group suggests that the

---

[1]Edmund N. Fulker, "Developing Basic Reading Skills in Adult Reading Programs," Reading for Effective Living, (New York: Scholastic Magazines, 1958), pp. 50-52.

[2]Irma T. Halfter and Frances M. Douglass, "Inadequate College Readers," Journal of Developmental Reading, I (Summer, 1958), pp. 42-53.

[3]Philip Shaw, "Reading in College," Sixtiety Yearbook, National Society for the Study of Education, Part I (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), pp. 336-354.

interest and difficulty level be in keeping with the group's common needs and understandings, and that they truly contain the kinds of skill-building characteristics that are to be included in the program.

Summary of related literature.--The summary of related literature pertaining to the problem of this research is based upon the findings of Causey and Shaw. Causey's survey was made during the session of 1955-56 to determine the extent of development of reading programs in colleges and universities in the United States. The report as published in the Fifth Yearbook of the Southwest Reading Conference is as follows:

1. The titles of courses were reported as follows: Reading Improvement 221, Developmental Reading 66, English 54, Reading Laboratory 51, not given 34.

2. Departments responsible for instruction in the courses were reported as follows: English 126, Education 122, Psychology 48, Reading Clinic 21, Communications, 10, Humanities 5, not given 86.

3. The length of courses was reported as follows: More than eighteen weeks 16, eighteen weeks 99, sixteen weeks 67, twelve weeks 70, ten weeks 29, nine weeks 10, less than nine weeks 54, not reported 73.

4. Credit allowed was reported as follows: five hours 4, three hours 42, two hours 48, one hour 48, no credit 132, not reported 144.

5. The number of class meetings per week was reported as follows: one meeting per week 45, two meetings 176, three meetings 109, four meetings 21, five meetings 19, not reported 48.

6. The use of instruments was reported by institutions as follows: reading pacers, tachistoscopes and reading films 94, pacers and tachistoscopes 94, pacers and films 39, tachistoscopes and films 16, pacers only 70, tachistoscopes only 14, films only 18, none 46.[1]

---

[1]Oscar S. Causey, "College Reading Programs In the Nation," Fifth Yearbook, Southwest Reading Conference for Colleges and Universities, (Fort Worth, Texas: Texas Christian University Press, 1956), pp. 136-137.

Shaw's findings show that formal course work has been offered in institutions of higher learning under the auspices of many departments: psychology, English, education, educational psychology and personnel services. In each of these, different approaches or combinations of approaches have been used so that no one college reading program can be considered universal.

Shaw summarized the organizational status of college reading courses in this manner:

> No conclusive study has yet been published concerning the number and advantages of each of the three basic kinds of college reading-improvement programs: (a) a separate, special service; (b) a part of a language-arts course; (c) an intrinsic part of each subject. At present, organization of reading courses as a special service seems to be most common.[1]

He has classified them further as having three basic orientations:

> (a) mechanical-aid oriented, (b) textbook oriented, and (c) counselling oriented. Each of these can be discerned in courses taught under the aegis of different departments.[2]

These two researchers appeared unique as they are the only ones who have explored extensively the organization and practices of college reading-improvement programs, as seen through the literature, with merit for this study.

---

[1]Philip Shaw, "Reading in College," Sixtieth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), pp. 336-354.

[2]Ibid., p. 350.

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Organization and treatment of data.--This chapter presents the reported results of the selected group of institutions in terms of specific categories surveyed in the literature regarding reading-improvement programs.

More specifically, the data presented in this chapter are organized around the following areas of concern as stated in the purposes of the study:

1. The presence or absence of a formal reading program
2. Provision for "slow," "average," and "able" readers
3. The screening process used to detect students in need of special help in reading
4. The extent of the testing program
5. Provisions and policies for termination of training
6. The department in which the reading classes or services are placed
7. The designation as a requirement or as a part of an orientation program.
8. The methods of instruction employed to accelerate achievement or eradicate the reading difficulties
9. The types of reading materials and mechanical aids

The tabulations of specific responses, to the questionnaires submitted to the institutions participating in The United Negro College

Fund, are found in the Appendix.

The presence or absence of a formal reading program.--The responses shown in Table 1, page 47, show a considerable development among reading programs at these institutions. Specifically, 16 or 84 per cent of the respondents indicated substantial increase in services, participants, and/or personnel. Only three or 16 per cent of the responding institutions failed to provide reading-improvement courses. The existence of such programs provided some evidence of the degree of professional concern with reading at the college level and was in harmony with the reported results of national trends in program development.

In terms of growth of programs, the distribution showed varied degrees of program development. Twenty-five per cent of the schools indicated great increases; six per cent indicated moderate increases; 13 per cent reported very little increase; 13 per cent showed no increase. Six per cent showed increases in materials. Six per cent were first year programs; 13 per cent of the schools grew in staff from one to three teachers; and 19 per cent failed to report progress.

Provisions for "slow," "average," and "able" readers.--The data in Table 2, page 48, reveal the curriculum designs providing for "slow" readers in 19 per cent of the institutions. Provisions for both "able" and "average" readers were reported by 13 per cent of the schools and those schools providing for "all" readers totaled 50 per cent. Those schools failing to report totaled 25 per cent. This information clearly indicated that the trend appeared to be toward instruction for a larger proportion of the college population; possibly to accommodate "all" readers.

TABLE 1

REPORT OF THE PRESENCE OR ABSENCE OF A FORMAL READING PROGRAM AND THE GROWTH OF THESE PROGRAMS

Reading Improvement Course	Yes	Extent to which the program has grown in the last five years									
		No	Greatly	Improved	Very Little	First Year	From one teacher to three	Material Increase	None	Not Reported
Atlanta University	x		x							
Bennett College	x									x
Bethune-Cookman College	x								x	
Bishop College	x			x						
Clark College	x		x							
Fisk University		x								
Huston-Tillotson College	x				x					
Interdenominational Theological Center		x								
Johnson C. Smith Univ.	x									
Lane College	x				x					
Lemoyne College	x									x
Livingstone College	x					x				
Morehouse College	x		x							
Morris Brown College	x						x			
Philander Smith College	x								x	
St. Paul's College		x								
Spelman College	x									x
Tougaloo College	x							x		
Tuskegee Institute	x						x			
Per Cent	84	15	25	6	13	6	13	6	13	19

TABLE 2

REPORT OF INSTITUTIONS WITH PROVISIONS FOR "SLOW," "AVERAGE", AND "ABLE" READERS

Institution	Slow	Able	Average	Specify (All)	Not Reported
Atlanta University				x	
Bennett College	x				
Bethune-Cookman College					x
Bishop College				x	
Clark College				x	
Fisk University					
Huston-Tillotson College	x				
Interdenominational Theological Center					
Johnson C. Smith Univ.				x	
Lane College					x
LeMoyne College					x
Livingstone College		x	x		
Morehouse College				x	
Morris Brown College				x	
Philander Smith College					x
St. Paul's College					
Spelman College				x	
Tougaloo College				x	
Tuskegee Institute	x				

The screening process used to detect students in need of special help in reading.--In general, the screening of students in the respective schools showed considerable similarity. Notwithstanding the noteworthy wide range of means adopted for screening, it was apparent that the most widely used practices were (1) a requirement for all freshmen or (2) a standardized test. The latter was more prevalent; however, the former was gaining in acceptance.

The extent of the testing program.--The data in Table 3, page 50 revealed that there was great diversity in the tests used as "pre" and "post" class measurements of growth in reading skills. Reporting use of the Iowa Silent Reading Test were 37 per cent of the schools. The Nelson-Denny Test was used by 19 per cent of the institutions. Schools reporting use of the Cooperative Reading Test and Diagnostic Reading Survey, were 19 per cent each. The Stanford Achievement Reading Test was used by six per cent of the schools with teacher devised tests ranking 13 per cent, and tests at the end of the texts as six per cent. Six per cent of the schools failed to report. The Iowa Silent Reading Test was still most widely used as a measure of reading status.

Provision and policies for termination of training.--Table 4, page 50, presents significant responses regarding the criterion used as a basic release policy for clients. Standardized test results were reported for 31 per cent of these institutions. Schools using the completion of the course as their "release" policy reported 31 per cent, also. Those failing to report totaled 38 per cent.

Factors used in analyzing reading progress are shown in Table 5, page 51. Thirteen per cent of these schools reported rate of reading as

TABLE 3

EXTENT OF THE TESTING PROGRAM REPORTED BY THE INSTITUTIONS

Tests used for measurements of growth and skill	Number of Institutions	Per Cent
Iowa Silent Reading	6	37
Nelson-Denny	3	19
Cooperative Reading	3	19
Stanford Achievement Reading	1	6
Diagnostic Reading Survey	3	19
Teacher Devised Tests	2	13
Tests at end of Texts	1	6
Not reported	1	6

TABLE 4

PROVISIONS AND POLICIES FOR TERMINATION OF TRAINING IN READING

Criteria used as a basic "release" policy for clients	Number of Institutions	Per Cent
Standardized Tests	5	31
Completion of course	5	31
Not reported	6	38

TABLE 5

FACTORS USED IN ANALYZING READING PROGRESS

Factors Used in Analyzing Reading Progress	Number of Institutions	Per Cent
Rate of Reading	2	13
Comprehension	7	44
Efficiency	9	56
Other	3	19
Not Reported	1	6

an important factor in analyzing reading progress for "release" purposes. Comprehension was reported as the main factor for 44 per cent of the schools. Efficiency, however, ranked 56 per cent. Those reporting other methods of analyzing reading progress were 19 per cent, and those failing to report were 6 per cent.

The department in which the reading classes or services were placed.--Reported results shown in Table 6, page 52, indicated that 56 per cent of the institutions conducted their programs under the auspices of the English department. Reading departments ranked 13 per cent and the results showed education departments as 25 per cent. Those indicating other departments were 13 per cent and those not reporting were six per cent.

The data in Table 7, page 52, reveal the reported provisions for instruction in regular and separate courses in reading. These data show that 31 per cent reported being a part of a "regular" course, and 63

TABLE 6

REPORT OF INSTITUTIONS ON THE DEPARTMENT IN WHICH THE READING CLASSES OR SERVICES ARE PLACED

Department in which the Reading Classes or Services are placed	Number of Institutions	Per Cent
English	9	56
Reading	2	13
Education	4	25
Not reported	1	6
Other	2	13

per cent were separate courses. These data substantiate the literature.

TABLE 7

PROVISIONS FOR INSTRUCTION IN REGULAR AND SEPARATE COURSES IN READING

Provisions for Instruction in Regular and Separate Courses	Number of Institutions	Per Cent
Regular	5	31
Separate	10	62
Not Reported	1	6

Reading as a credit or non-credit course.--Table 8, page 53, presents significant responses to the important question of academic credit

TABLE 8

NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF CREDIT OR NON-CREDIT COURSES AND QUARTER OR SEMESTER ORGANIZATION

Credits Given	Number of Institutions	Per Cent
Quarter basis	1	6
Semester basis	7	44
Not reported	8	50
No credit	7	44
1 credit	2	13
2 credits	2	13
3 credits	5	31
Other	1	6

given for courses in reading. These data indicated that 44 per cent of the reporting schools offered no academic credit for this course. One credit was given by 13 per cent of the schools while the same percentage was reported for two credits. Three credits were given by 31 per cent of the schools, and one school reported without qualification.

Regarding the designating of reading as a requirement or as a part of an orientation program, Table 9, page 54, lists reading as a required freshman course for 75 per cent of the reporting schools. One school reported an orientation program and 13 per cent of the schools stated that their programs were not required. The uniqueness of school number 1 necessitated its being classified as "other".

TABLE 9

REPORT OF INSTITUTIONS ON THE DESIGNATION OF READING AS A REQUIREMENT OR AS A PART OF AN ORIENTATION PROGRAM

Designation of Requirements	Number of Institutions	Per Cent
Required	12	75
Orientation	1	6
Not required	2	13
Other	1	6

The methods of instruction employed to accelerate achievement in reading or eradicate the reading difficulties.--These data revealed that the basic plans of instructions employed were 56 per cent, using basically group practice with workbooks for whole groups, supplemented by individual practice with mechanical aids; six per cent, using basically group practice with mechanical aids supplemented by individual practice in workbooks; 13 per cent, using class subdivisions into homogeneous groups for workbook practice; 13 per cent, using individualized programs planned for each individual's needs with no common group work for all; 13 per cent, utilizing other organizational plans but failing to specify; and 13 per cent, failing to report. Table 10, page 55, shows this distribution.

The types of reading materials used.--The data in Table 11, page 56, indicated a trend toward emphasis on a variety of materials rather than a basic manual for all members of the group. Thirty-eight per cent of the institutions reported, thusly. Twenty-five per cent listed

TABLE 10

METHODS OF INSTRUCTION EMPLOYED TO ACCELERATE ACHIEVEMENT IN READING OR TO ERADICATE THE READING DIFFICULTIES

Description of basic Instructional plans	Number of Institutions	Per Cent
Basically, group practice using workbooks with whole group, supplemented by individual practice with mechanical aids	9	56
Basically, group practice with mechanical aids supplemented by individual practice in workbooks	1	6
Class subdivision into homogeneous groups for workbook practice	2	13
Individualized program planned for each individual's needs with no common group work for all	2	13
Others	2	13
Not reported	2	13

Spache, The Art of Efficient Reading; Miller, Increasing Reading Efficiency; Smith, Be A Better Reader (Series) and Guiler and Coleman, Reading for Meaning as their basic manuals for workbooks. Nineteen per cent reported using McCallister, Purposeful Reading in College; Glock, The Improvement of College Reading; Wedeen, College Remedial Reader; and the SRA Reading Laboratory as their basic point of reference. Thirteen per cent reported using Smith and Haag, Better Reading I and II; Lee Harbrace Vocabulary Guide; and Gilbert, Breaking the Reading Barrier. Ranking as six per cent were Robinson, Effective Study Skills; Shoffer

TABLE 11

REPORT OF INSTITUTIONS ON MANUALS OR WORKBOOKS USED AS A BASIC MANUAL FOR ALL MEMBERS OF THE GROUP

Basic manuals or workbooks used for all members of group	Number of Institutions	Per Cent
Robinson, Effective Study Skills	1	6
Shoffer and Shaw, Handbook of English	1	6
McCallister, Purposeful Reading in College	3	19
Glock, The Improvement of College Reading	3	19
Wedeen, College Remedial Reader	3	19
Spache, The Art of Efficient Reading	4	25
Miller, Increasing Reading Efficiency	4	25
Smith, Be A Better Reader (Series)	4	25
Guiler and Coleman, Reading for Meaning	4	25
Weber, Reading and Vocabulary Development	1	6
Blair-Gerber, Better Reading I and II	1	6
Smith and Haag, Learning to Learn	2	13
Lee, Harbrace Vocabulary Guide	2	13
SRA Reading Laboratory	3	19
Gilbert, Breaking the Reading Barrier	2	13
Variety	6	38
Not reported	1	6

AND Shaw, Handbook of English; Weber, Reading and Vocabulary Development and Blair-Gerber, Better Reading I and II. One school failed to report.

These findings are certainly in harmony with the literature and

the commonality of their titles, as seen in the "Compendium" of the five reporting colleges comprising the Atlanta University Reading Center, further substantiated their frequency of use. Variety, however, appeared to be the point of merit in this area.

The types of mechanical equipment used in reading instruction.--Results show in Table 12, page 58, that there was variety in the mechanical equipment employed for diagnostic, motivational and training purposes. For diagnostic purposes, the Telebinocular was used by 44 per cent of the schools. The Ophthalmograph or Reading Eye Camera was used by 13 per cent.

For motivational purposes, Reading Accelerators were used by 56 per cent of the schools followed by the use of films, with a total of 44 per cent. The Tachistoscope and the Controlled Reader were used by 25 per cent of the schools. The Craig Reader and the Listen-Read Tape Series were reported as 13 per cent.

For training purposes, 81 per cent used Reading Accelerators, 50 per cent used films and the Controlled Reader, while 31 per cent and 38 per cent used the Tachistoscope and Listen-Read Tape Series, respectively. The Craig Reader was used by 19 per cent of the reporting schools.

As group drill, both the Tachistoscope and Controlled Reader were reported by 44 per cent of the schools. Twenty-five per cent used Reading Accelerators, while 13 per cent used films. One school or 6 per cent used Craig Readers.

These pieces of mechanical equipment seemed to be a part of all the reporting institutions with the method of use being the differentiating factor.

TABLE 12

REPORT OF INSTITUTIONS ON MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT EMPLOYED IN THE MAINTENANCE OF THEIR PROGRAMS

Mechanical Aids	Diagnosis	Per Cent	Motivation	Per Cent	Training	Per Cent	Group Drill	Per Cent
Ophthalmograph or Reading Eye Camera	2	13						
Tachistoscope			4	25	5	31	7	44
Telebinocular	7	44						
Reading Accelerators	2	13	9	56	11	81	4	25
Films	1	6	7	44	8	50	2	13
Craig Readers			2	13	3	19	1	6
Listen and Read Tapes	1	6	2	13	6	38	3	19
Controlled Reader	1	6	4	25	8	50	7	44
Not Reported	2	13						

Conclusions.--The analysis and interpretation of the data would appear to warrant the following conclusions.

1. These institutions showed considerable development of reading programs and this was in harmony with the reported results of national trends in program development.

2. The trend appeared to be toward instruction for a larger proportion of the college population as 50 per cent of the reporting institutions stated provision for "all" readers.

3. It was apparent that the most widely used practices of screening processes used to detect students in need of special help in reading were (a) a requirement for all freshmen, or (b) a standardized test.

4. The research is not comprehensive enough on the extent of the testing program but the Iowa Silent Reading Test, was the most widely used measure of reading status.

5. Standardized test results and the completion of the course are still the basic criteria used as "release" policy or termination of training. Efficiency ranked highest as the important factor in analyzing reading progress for "release" purpose.

6. Reading classes or services are primarily conducted under the auspices of the English department.

7. Reading was designated a required freshman course by 75% of the reporting schools and 44% of the schools offered no academic credit for the course.

8. The basic plan of instruction employed used basically group practice with workbooks for whole groups supplemented by individual practice with mechanical aids.

9. There was variety in materials used but the frequency of some indicated a degree of similarity among these programs. This similarity also was evident in the literature.

10. There seemed to be basic pieces of mechanical equipment used in all these programs with the method of use being the differentiating factor. Even here, however, there was a great degree of similarity.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Basic orientation and design of the study.--It is apparent that the field of reading improvement has many solid contributions to make to college and university educational efforts. Much progress has been made in this relatively young field, but the field has not yet "arrived." Workers in this area of educational effort need to be constantly striving to improve research knowledge, theory, and instructional practices. This work is eminently worthy of the most dedicated efforts of the best brains that we can find.[1]

The educational literature relating to reading, surveys of research and of resultant changes in classroom practices and programs and the considered judgment of specialists in the field, yield striking evidence of the expanding role of reading in the lives of children and adults. All sources of information point up the fact that reading instruction must increasingly contribute to the development of personalities with clear understanding and discriminating insight, capable of dealing with the new issues and problems - the social realities - of today.

Parelleling this interest in the social realities of today is the positively stated agreement among educators that reading instruction can contribute toward the development of an enlightened citizenry - stable

---

[1]Stanley E. Davis, "Current Emphases in Reading Instruction in American Colleges and Universities," Reading in A Changing Society, IV (May, 1959), p. 59.

personalities - capable of establishing the direction and form of the world society now in the making. It is the moral obligation of administrators and supervisors to assume leadership roles in the quest for new tools and new knowledge which will promote social understanding; the future demands acceptance of this high purpose.

It seems wise to conclude that future reading instruction programs will continue to give serious attention to translating what we know of how children can learn to understand and deal with social realities at their own levels of maturity into actual classroom instructional practices which will promote and sustain the development of social skills.

During the 1963-64 school year while serving as a graduate assistant in reading at Atlanta University, the writer became interested in the development of college reading-improvement programs and desired to survey the literature to note the nature, materials and trends in order to relate these findings to a select group of institutions. It seemed advantageous to have a concise representation of the literature in order to aid institutions in broadening, strengthening or developing reading programs.

This survey of college reading-improvement programs was two-fold in approach. First, through an intensive study of the literature an investigation was made of (1) the nature, (2) trends, (3) materials and equipment, and (4) reported results in reading programs and services for students throughout the nations; and, secondly, these findings were related to an actual survey of institutions which were actively participating in the United Negro College Fund program.

The specific purposes of the study were:

1. To determine from the intensive study of the literature

regarding reading-improvement programs:

a. The presence or absence of a formal reading program

b. Provisions for "slow," "average," and "able" readers

c. The screening process used to detect students in need of special help in reading

d. The extent of the testing program

e. Provisions and policies for termination of training

f. The department in which the reading classes or services were placed

g. The designation as a requirement or as a part of an orientation program

2. To classify reported results according to:

a. The methods of instruction employed to accelerate achievement or eradicate the reading difficulties

b. The types of reading aids and materials used

3. To determine any indication of agreement or disagreement with respect to the specific aspects of the program reviewed in the literature

4. To obtain actual information from the selected group of institutions in terms of the specific categories surveyed in the literature regarding reading-improvement programs

5. To relate these findings to the general survey for purposes of evaluation, implications, and recommendations

This study was limited to the extensiveness of the literature pertinent to college reading-improvement programs with special emphasis on the nature, reported results, trends and materials.

The study was limited further in the success of the questionnaire as distributed to participating colleges of The United Negro College Fund.

In this study the Descriptive Survey Method was used utilizing questionnaires.

The steps which were used to complete this study are outlined below:

1. The related literature pertinent to this study was reviewed and organized for presentation in a finished thesis.

2. A set of specific categories was formulated for purposes of studying reading-improvement programs in accordance with the purposes of the study.

3. Specific investigation of the literature was made in order to determine the status and characteristics of reading-improvement classes and services.

4. The colleges and universities who were participating in The United Negro College Fund Program were issued questionnaires for execution and returning.

5. The findings were classified and interpreted according to the purposes of the study.

Summary of related literature.--Whether one likes it or not, American schools are faced with the task of dealing with inadequate readers or non-readers, in all their complicated befuddlement. They are fast becoming an important segment of the college group; in fact, they have been there for some time now, sometimes in uncomfortably large numbers; without doubt, they are also thwarting some of the best laid plans of the most conscientious teachers.[1] Education at the college level is confronted with the need of improving the reading skills of students so that they will be able to meet successfully the requirements laid upon them.[2]

College professors like other adults throughout the country are bewildered by the lack of reading ability of the college student. Each professor has reasons as to why this inadequacy exists. As usual, the blame is placed on the lower echelons and progressive or modern education. The

---

[1]Allen M. Pitkanen, "Inadequate Readers in the Classroom," Clearing House, XXXV (May, 1961), pp. 557-561.

[2]Frederick L. Westover and William F. Anderson, "A Reading Improvement Course at the University of Alabama," School and Society, LLII (April, 1956), pp. 152-153.

college student, the object of the furor, does not seem as confused as the instructors. Often he thinks it would be advantageous if he could read better but other than a verbalization to that effect most college students do little or nothing.

In view of these quantitative circumstances, group training for reading improvement becomes imperative - the collegiate educational process has now truly taken on the aspects of a mass enterprise in many ways. It will not suffice merely to shrug off the burden by blandly asserting that many of those who matriculate "just don't belong in college," that they are not "college material." Instead, it must be realized that a considerable number of these young people have not had the necessary training or have not assimilated it adequately, that they have been, at least in some respects, slow to mature. To be sure, they are in some ways incompetent to carry a regular college program, but first-hand reading courses will enable a good many of them to become capable students.

A concept, prevalent a number of years ago, that formal reading instruction should terminate at the end of the intermediate grades is changing. Today, most educational leaders believe that some guidance in reading should extend through college and later years. The 47th Yearbook Committee of the National Society for the Study of Education expressed this point of view:

> Competence in reading, as in all other intellectual activities, is the product of continuous growth and careful guidance throughout school and college years, and even later.[1]

The above would seem to be conclusive proof that anyone who is engaged

---

[1]Reading in High School and College: Forty-Seventh Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948), p. 31.

in education, whether at the elementary, the secondary, or the college level, has a moral obligation to discharge - he must offer expert guidance to his students as they seek to acquire the mature aspects of the art or skill in reading.

While there are a few investigations which have challenged the value of college reading instruction, there are a great many which have given evidence to the worthwhileness of this training. One of the most carefully planned experiments is that reported by McDonald who compared groups of students who had taken the reading course at Cornell University with matched groups who had not taken reading training.[1] McDonald found that students who had taken the reading instruction had higher grade point averages than his control group and were less likely to drop out of college than were either the controls or their classmates not involved in the experiment. A somewhat similar advantage in favor of the reading-trained students was reported at New Mexico College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts by Willey and Thomson, who demonstrated that freshmen who had taken the reading instruction had a significant grade point superiority over matched controls.[2]

Two studies reported in the Journal of Developmental Reading have provided evidence that improvement in reading ability has been accomplished by better performance in other academic areas. Mary Mills described a reading program in one of the Wisconsin state colleges.[3] While Mills and

---

[1]Arthur S. McDonald, "Influence of a College Reading Improvement Program on Academic Performance," Journal of Educational Psychology, XLVIII (March, 1957), pp. 171-181.

[2]D. S. Willey and C. W. Thomson, "Effective Reading and Grade-Point Improvement with College Freshmen," School and Society, XXCIII (April, 1956), pp. 134-135.

[3]Mary Mills, "Reading and the Freshman English Program," Journal of Developmental Reading, IV (October, 1957), pp. 6-8.

her colleagues were gratified with the improved reading abilities of their students, they were even more satisfied with the improvements observed in student's writing. "With no direct instruction in writing techniques, students in the experimental (reading) classes came to write better themes and to observe more carefully the conventions of mechanics and grammar, than students in the control sections did." At St. Francis College, two professors who represented the history and education departments set up a reading course which not only increased the ability of the students to read historical context but also caused the grade point of this same group of readers to be higher than average in a course in history.[1]

Several other evidences of the recognition of the importance of training in reading during college and the years after formal schooling ends can be found in the studies of the value of remedial and corrective programs and the effect of such programs on scholarship and the individual. These findings and similar ones are reported in the text of the thesis.

General summary of pertinent literature regarding reading programs throughout the nation.--The general summary of pertinent literature pertaining to the problem of this research is based upon the findings of Causey and Shaw. Causey's survey was made during the session of 1955-56 to determine the extent of development of reading programs in colleges and universities in the United States. The report as published in the Fifth Yearbook of the Southwest Reading Conference is as follows:

> 1. The titles of courses were reported as follows: Reading Improvement 221, Developmental Reading 66, English 54, Reading

---

[1]Sister M. Fridian and Sister M. Rosanna, "A Developmental Reading Experiment in a European History Class," Journal of Developmental Reading II (Winter, 1958), pp. 3-7.

Laboratory 51, not given 34.

2. Departments responsible for instruction in the courses were reported as follows: English 126, Education 122, Psychology 48, Reading Clinic 21, Communications 10, Humanities 5, not given 86.

3. The length of courses was reported as follows: More than eighteen weeks 16, eighteen weeks 99, sixteen weeks 67, twelve weeks 70, ten weeks 29, nine weeks 10, less than nine weeks 54, not reported 73.

4. Credit allowed was reported as follows: Five hours 4, three hours 42, two hours 48, one hour 48, no credit 132, not reported 144.

5. The number of class meetings per week was reported as follows: one meeting per week 45, two meetings 176, three meetings 109, four meetings 21, five meetings 19, not reported 48.

6. The use of instruments was reported by institutions as follows: reading pacers, tachistoscopes and reading films 94, pacer and tachistoscopes 94, pacers and films 39, tachistoscopes and films 16, pacers only 70, tachistoscopes only 14, films only 18, none 46.[1]

Shaw's findings showed that formal course work had been offered in institutions of higher learning under the auspices of many departments: psychology, English, education, Educational psychology and personal services. In each of these, different approaches or combinations of approaches have been used so that no one college reading program can be considered universal.

Shaw summarized the organizational status of college reading courses in this manner:

> No conclusive study has yet been published concerning the number and advantages of each of the three basic kinds of college reading-improvement programs: (a) a separate, special service; (b) a part of a language-arts course; (c) an intrinsic part of each subject. At present, organization of reading courses as a special service seems to be the most common.[2]

---

[1]Oscar S. Causey, "College Reading Programs in the Nation," Fifth Yearbook, Southwest Reading Conference for Colleges and Universities (Fort Worth Texas: Texas Christian University Press, 1956), pp. 136-137.

[2]Philip Shaw, "Reading in College," Sixtieth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), pp. 336-354.

He has classified them further as having three basic orientations:

> (a) Mechanical-aid oriented, (b) textbook oriented, and (c) counselling oriented. Each of these can be discerned in courses taught under the aegis of different departments.[1]

These two researchers appeared unique as they are the only ones who have explored extensively the organization and practices of college reading-improvement programs, as seen through the literature, with merit for this study.

General summary of pertinent data.--The analysis and interpretation of the data would appear to warrant the following summary:

1. These institutions showed considerable development of reading programs and this was in harmony with the reported results of national trends in program development.

2. The trend appeared to be toward instruction for a larger proportion of the college population as fifty percent of the reporting institutions stated provision for "all" readers.

3. It was apparent that the most widely used practices of screening processes used to detect students in need of special help in reading were (1) a requirement for all freshmen, or (2) a standardized test.

4. The research was not comprehensive enough on the extent to the testing programs but the "Iowa Silent Reading Test," was the most widely used measure of reading status.

5. Standardized test results and the completion of the course were still the basic criteria used as "release" policy or termination of training. Efficiency ranked highest as the important factor in analyzing reading

---

[1]Ibid., p. 350.

progress for "release" purposes.

6. Reading classes or services were primarily conducted under the auspices of the English department.

7. Reading was designated a required freshman course by 75 per cent of the reporting schools and 44 per cent of the schools offered no academic credit for the course.

8. The chief plan of instruction employed used basically group practice with workbooks for whole groups supplemented by individual practice with mechanical aids.

9. The trend in materials and mechanical aids was toward utilization of a variety of these materials and equipment.

Conclusion.--The analysis and interpretation of the data would appear to warrant the following conclusions:

1. Most of the literature has attempted to explain the methods and material used to achieve student improvement in reading rather than the particulars of individual programs.

2. There was great variation in the length of courses offered by various schools and in the types of practice material used.

3. College programs were very similar, and on the whole, they were skills centered with practice books and mechanical devices as major means of facilitating growth.

4. The most popular method of instruction was through group procedures, using workbooks for whole-group practice with mechanical aids, supplemented by individual practice in workbooks.

5. It was reasonably concluded that methods of organizational currently remain in a very fluid and experimental state.

6. The research was not comprehensive enough on the extent of the testing programs but the Iowa Silent Reading Test was the most widely used measure of reading status.

7. There were similarities in the materials used as 'basic' materials for these programs and the differentiating factors seemed to be the degree of variety and the skill emphasis.

8. There was general endorsement and utilization of mechanical equipment in these programs, and all reported ownership of some apparatus.

Implications.--The interpretation of the findings of this research would appear to warrant the following statements of implications:

1. Probably the most controversial tools found in college programs are the mechanical devices used to improve reading rate.

2. There is considerable development of reading programs.

3. Clarity is needed for such areas of concern as - titles of the courses, academic credit given, duration of courses, auspices of which department, and the extent of the testing program.

4. The trend appeared to be toward instruction for a larger proportion of the college population; possibly, to accommodate "all" readers.

5. It was apparent that the field of reading improvement had many solid contributions to make to college and university educational efforts.

Recommendations.--The analysis and interpretation of the data of this research appear to justify the following recommendations:

1. That more researchers report the particulars on individual programs.

2. That reading instruction be made available to all college freshmen with emphases on levels of proficiency.

3. That reading instruments have a permanent place in reading improvement programs.

4. That the selection of methods and materials for a program of reading improvement should be based on the needs of the individual.

5. That more experimentation and research be carried on regularly by teachers of reading and made easily and readily accessible for use.

6. That the average size of the groups be kept small so that a degree of individualized instruction may be possible.

7. That there be some follow-up of clients in order to add stability to programs, in general.

8. That teachers of reading be consulted regarding what they feel they need to meet current unfilled needs in the classroom.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Bliesmer, Emery P. and Staiger, Ralph C. Problems, Programs and Projects in College-Adult Reading. Milwaukee: The National Reading Conference, Inc., 1952.

Causey, Oscar S. Exploring the Goals of College Reading Programs. Fort Worth, Texas: Texas Christian University Press, 1956.

Flesch, Rudolf. Why Johnny Can't Read and What You Can Do About It. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1955.

Newton, J. Roy. Reading in Your School. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960.

Spache, George D. Are We Teaching Reading? Gainesville, Florida: University of Florida Press, 1956.

Tinker, Miles A. and McCullough, Constance. Teaching Elementary Reading. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1962.

Warner, W. L. Meeker, Marcia, and Eells, Kenneth. Social Class in America. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1949.

Articles and Periodicals

Acker, Ralph S. "Reading Improvement in Government and Business," Education, LXXXII (March, 1962), 428-431.

_____. "Reading Improvement in Military, Government and Business Agencies," The Reading Teacher, XIV (November, 1960), 89-92.

Barbe, Walter B. "The Effectiveness of Work in Remedial Reading at the College Level," Journal of Educational Psychology, XLIII (April, 1952), 229-237.

_____. "Reading Improvement Service in Colleges and Universities," School and Society, LXXIV (July, 1951), 6-7.

Beecher, Barbara A. "Reading Improvement and Psychological Orientation," Journal of Developmental Reading, IV (Winter, 1962), 133.

Beasley, Charles. "A Freshman Reading Program," Journal of Developmental

Reading, II (Winter, 1959), 23-29.

Blake, Walter S. "College Level Study Skills Program - Some Observations," Junior College Journal, XXV (November, 1954), 148-150.

_____. "Do Probationary College Freshmen Benefit from Compulsory Study Skills and Reading Training?" Journal of Experimental Education, XXV (September, 1956), 91-93.

Bliesmer, Emery P. "Future Practices in Reading Instruction in Adult Programs," Reading in a Changing Society, IV (May, 1959), 120-123.

Busnell, Guy Thomas. "Remedial Reading at the College and Adult Levels," An Experimental Study," Recent Trends in Reading, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939.

Causey, Oscar S. "A Decade of Progress in Colleges," Education, LXXX (May, 1960), 549-551.

Charters, W. W. "Remedial Reading in College," Journal of Higher Education, XII (March, 1941), 117-121.

Colvin, Charles R. "What is Being Done in College Reading Programs in Pennsylvania," Journal of Developmental Reading, V (Autumn, 1961), 72.

Davis, Stanley E. "Current Emphases in Reading Instruction in American Colleges and Universities," Reading in a Changing Society, IV (May, 1959), 59.

Dearborn, Walter F. and Wilking, S. Vincent, "Improving the Reading of College Freshmen," School Review, XLIX (November, 1941), 668-678.

Feinburg, Mortimer, Long, L. and Rosencheck, V. "Results of a Mandatory Study Course for Entering Freshmen," Journal of Developmental Reading, V (Winter, 1962), 95-100.

Fridian, Sister M. and Rosanna, Sister M. "A Developmental Reading Experiment in a European History Class," Journal of Developmental Reading, II (Winter, 1958), 3-7.

Fulker, Edmund N. "Developing Basic Reading Skills in Adult Reading Programs," Reading for Effective Living, New York: Scholastic Magazines, 1958.

Gates, Arthur I. "Teaching Machines in Perspective," Elementary School Journal, LXII (October, 1961), 6.

Gladfelter, Millard E. "An Analysis of Reading and English Changes That Occur During the Freshman Year in College," Journal of the American

Association of Collegiate Registrars, XX (July, 1945), 527-543.

Gray, William S. and Iverson, William S. "What Should Be The Profession's Attitude Toward Lay Criticism of the Schools? With Reference to Reading?", Elementary School Journal, LIII (September, 1952), 24.

Halfter, Irma T. and Douglass, Frances M. "Inadequate College Readers," Journal of Developmental Reading, I (Summer, 1958), 42-53.

Hill, Walter R. "Factors Associated With Comprehension Deficience of College Readers," Journal of Developmental Reading, III (Winter, 1959), 84-93.

Hinton, Evelyn A. "Dropout Rate and Academic Progress of Two Groups of Students Enrolled at the University of Wichita," Journal of Developmental Reading, IV (Summer, 1961), 272-275.

Holmes, Jack. "Personality Characteristics of the Disabled Reader," The Journal of Developmental Reading, IV (Winter, 1961), 111-122.

_____. "Factors Underlying Major Disabilities at The College Level," Genetic Psychology Monographs, XLIX (1954), 3-95.

Hovens, Virginia. "A Prediction of Low School Achievement from High School Rank, Reading Test Scores, Psychology Test Scores, and Average Grades in Pre-Law Courses," Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXIX (April, 1948), 237-242.

Jackson, R. "Prediction of the Academic Success of College Freshmen," Journal of Educational Psychology, XLVI (1955), 296-301.

Karlin, Robert. "Machines and Reading: A Review of Research," Clearing House, XXXII (February, 1958), 352.

Kenworthy, C. W. "An Evaluation of the Results of Instruction and Practice in the Techniques of Better Reading," Journal of Developmental Reading, II (Summer, 1959), 11-16.

Kilby, Richard W. "The Relation of a Remedial Reading Program to Scholastic Success in College," Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXVI (December, 1945), 183-86.

Kingston, Albert J. and George, Clary E. "The Effects of Special Reading Training Upon the Development of College Students' Reading Skills," Journal of Educational Research, L (February, 1957), 471-475.

Laycock, Samuel R. and Russell, David H. "An Analysis of Thirty-Eight How-to-Study Manuals, " The School Review, XLIX (May, 1941), 370-379.

Lee, Maurice A. "Results of a College All-Freshman Reading Improvement Program," Journal of Developmental Reading, II (Autumn, 1958), 20-32.

Legere, John and Tracey, W. R. "Reading Improvement in An Army Service School," Journal of Developmental Reading, IV (Autumn, 1960), 41-46.

McCallister, J. M. "College Instruction in Reading," Phi Delta Kappan, XXIV (April, 1942), 311-13.

McCaul, Robert. "Student Personnel Opportunities for College Remedial-Reading Teachers," School Review, LI (March, 1943), 158-163.

McDonald, Arthur S. "Influence of a College Reading Improvement Program on Academic Performance," Journal of Educational Psychology, XLVIII (March, 1957), 171-181.

McDonald, Arthur and Byrne, James. "Four Questions on Objectives," Journal of Development Reading, I (Spring, 1958), 46-51.

McDonald, Arthur S. and Park, Walter. "Teaching College Freshmen to Read," Phi Delta Kappan, XXXVIII (December, 1956), 104-109.

McGann, Mary. "Improving the Scholarship of College Freshmen with Remedial Reading Instruction," Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXIX (March, 1948), 183-86.

McGinnis, Dorothy. "Corrective Reading: A Means of Increasing Scholastic Attainment at the College Level," Journal of Educational Psychology, XLII (March, 1951), 166-173.

Mills, Mary. "Reading and the Freshman Reading Program," Journal of Developmental Reading, IV (October, 1957), 6-8.

_____. "Reading and the Freshman English Program," Journal of Development Reading, I (Autumn, 1957), 3-6.

Mouly, George. "A Study of the Effects of a Remedial Reading Program on Academic Grades at the College Level," Journal of Educational Psychology, XLIII (December, 1952), 459-466.

Murdick, R. G. "Problems in Developing a Profitable Reading Improvement Course for Executives," Journal of Developmental Reading, II (Spring, 1959), 22-30.

Murphy, Harold and Davis, Frederick. "College Grades and Ability to Reason in Reading," Peabody Journal of Education, XXVII (July, 1949), 34-37.

National School Public Relations Association. "This Business About Johnny and His Reading: A Portfolio," ii (July, 1956).

O'Bear, Harry H. "Changes in the Academic Achievement of Matched Groups of Remedial Reading and Non-Remedial Reading Students at Indiana University," Studies in Education, School of Education, Indiana University, 1955.

Parry, Douglas F. "Reading Gains in a Freshman Remedial Program at Syracuse University," Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXII (November, 1941), 624-630.

Pitkanen, Allen M. "Inadequate Readers in the Classroom," Clearing House, XXXV (May, 1961), 557-561.

Poulton, E. C. "British Courses for Adults on Effective Reading," British Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXI (June, 1961), 128-137.

Preston, Ralph and Botel, Morton. "The Relation of Reading Skill and Other Factors to Academic Achievement of 2048 College Students," Journal of Experimental Education, XX (June, 1952), 363-371.

Rankin, Earl Jr. "Reading Test Reliability and Validity as a Function of Introversion-Extroversion," Journal of Developmental Reading, VI (Winter, 1963), 106-117.

Raygor, Alton. "Measurement in Reading," Tenth Yearbook, National Reading Conference. Milwaukee: National Reading Conference, 1961.

Raygor, Alton, Vance, E. V., and Adcock, Donna. "The Diagnosis and Treatment of College Reading Difficulties Using Patterns of Symtomatic Statements," Journal of Developmental Reading, III (Autumn, 1959), 3-10.

Research Division of the National Education Association: "Better Reading Instruction," Research Bulletin, No. 13 (November, 1935), 299.

Robinson, H. A. "A Note on the Evaluation of College Remedial Reading Courses," Journal of Educational Psychology, XLI (February, 1950), 83-96.

Ronson, Kathleen M. "An Evaluation of Certain Aspects of the Reading and Study Program at the University of Missouri," Journal of Educational Research, XLVIII (February, 1955), 443-454.

Russell, Davis S. "What Is Right With Our Public Schools," NEA Journal, XXXIX (May, 1950), 366-367.

Scott, Frances D. "Evaluation of a College Reading Program," Journal of Developmental Reading, II (Autumn, 1958), 40.

Shaw, Philip. "Reading in College," Sixtieth Yearbook, National Society for the Study of Education, Part I, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Simpson, Robert G. "The Reading Laboratory as a Service Unit in College," School and Society, LV (May, 1942), 621-623.

Smith, Donald and Wood, Roger. "Reading Improvement and College Grades: A Follow-Up," Journal of Educational Psychology, XLVI (March, 1955), 151-159.

Sullivan, Eugene. "Dissertations in College Reading: 1918 to October 1960," Journak of Developmental Reading, IV (Autumn, 1960), 268-271.

Taylor, Stanford E. "Reading Instrument Usage," The Reading Teacher, XV (May, 1962), 449-454.

Thompson, Warren Craig. "A Book-Centered Course Versus a Machine-Centered Course in Adult Reading Improvement," Journal of Educational Research, XLIX (February, 1956), 437-445.

Tinker, Miles A. "The Role of Eye Movements in Diagnostic on Remedial Reading," School and Society, XXXIX (February, 1934), 147-148.

Traxler, Arthur E. and Townsend, Agatha. Eight More Years of Research in Reading: Summary and Bibliography, New York: Educational Records Bureau, 1955.

Triggs, Frances P. "Remedial Reading Programs: Evidence of Their Development," Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXIII (December, 1942), 678-685.

Vineyard, Edwin E. and Bailey, Robert. "Interrelationships of Reading Ability, Listening Skill, Intelligence, and Scholastic Achievement," Journal of Developmental Reading, III (Spring, 1960), 174-178.

Westover, Frederick L. and Anderson, William F. "A Reading Improvement Course at the University of Alabama," School and Society, LLIII (April, 1956), 152-153.

Wilking, Vincent S. "The Improvement of Reading Ability in College," Education, LXII (September, 1941), 27-31.

Willey, D. S. and Thomson, C. W. "Effective Reading and Grade-Point Improvement with College Freshmen," School and Society, XXCIII (April, 1956), 134-135.

Willey, D. S. and Thompson, C. W. "Effective Reading and Grade-Point Improvement with College Freshmen," School and Society, LXxx LXXXIII (April 14, 1965), 134-135.

Witty, Paul A. "Are Children Learning to Read?" School and Society, LXXV (May, 1952), 289-294.

_____. "Practices in Corrective Reading in Colleges and Universities," School and Society, LII (November, 1940), 564-568.

_____, Stolarx, Theodore and Cooper, William. "Some Results of a Remedial Reading Program for College Students," School and Society, LXXXVI (December, 1952), 378-380.

Zerga, Joseph E. "Remedial Reading Programs," Junior College Journal, XI (December, 1940), 194-195.

Yearbooks

Andrews, Wade. "Junior College Reading Programs: Goals and Techniques," Fifth Yearbook, Southwest Reading Conference for Colleges and Universities. Fort Worth, Texas: The Texas University Press, 1957.

Bliesmer, Emery P. "Recent Research in Reading on the College Level," Second Yearbook, Southwest Reading Conference. Fort Worth, Texas: The Texas University Press, 1952.

_____. "Recent Research In Reading on the College Level," Third Yearbook, Southwest Reading Conference. Fort Worth, Texas: The Texas University Press, 1953.

Bracken, Dorothy K. "Problems Involved," Fourth Yearbook, Southwest Reading Conference. Fort Worth, Texas: The Texas University Press, 1955.

Causey, Oscar S. "College Reading Programs in the Nation," Fifth Yearbook, Southwest Reading Conference for Colleges and Universities. Fort Worth, Texas: Texas Christian University Press, 1956.

Dotson, Elsie. "Grouping in Remedial Reading," Third Yearbook, Southwest Reading Conference for Colleges and Universities. Fort Worth, Texas: The Texas University Press, 1957.

Eller, William. "Starting a College Reading Program," Eighth Yearbook, National Reading Conference. Fort Worth, Texas: Texas University Press, 1959.

Fulker, Edmund N. "A Decade of Progress in College and Adult Reading Improvement," Seventh Yearbook, National Reading Conference for Colleges and Adults. Fort Worth, Texas: Texas Christian University Press, 1958.

Jones, Ernest A. "A Small College Reading Program," Sixth Yearbook, Southwest Reading Conference for Colleges and Universities. Fort Worth, Texas: Texas Christian University Press, 1957.

Kingston, Albert J. "Analysis of Reading Questionnaire for Texas Society for College Teachers of Education," Third Yearbook, Southwest Reading Conference for Colleges and Universities. Fort Worth, Texas: The Texas University Press, 1954.

McDonald, Arthur. "A College Reading Program and Academic Performance," Sixth Yearbook, Southwest Reading Conference for Colleges and Universities. Fort Worth, Texas: Texas Christian University Press, 1957.

McDonald, Arthur, Edwin, S., and Byrne, James. "Reading Deficiencies and Personality Factors: A Comprehensive Treatment," Eighth Yearbook, National Reading Conference. Milwaukee: National Reading Conference, 1959.

McMillon, John W. "Reading Improvement in Business," Fifth Yearbook, Southwest Reading Conference for Colleges and Universities. Fort Worth, Texas: Texas University Press, 1955.

Miller, Lyle L. "Current Use of Workbooks and Mechanical Aids," Eighth Yearbook, Southwest Reading Conference for Colleges and Universities, Fort Worth, Texas: Texas Christian University Press, 1959.

_____. "Evaluation of Workbooks for College Reading Programs," Sixth Yearbook, Southwest Reading Conference for Colleges and Adults. Fort Worth, Texas: Texas Christian University Press, 1957.

Pellettieri, A. J. "Reading Programs for Adults," Third Yearbook, Southwest Reading Conference for Colleges and Universities. Fort Worth, Texas: The Texas University Press, 1954.

Rankin, Earl F., Jr. "Reading Test Performances of Introverts and Extroverts," Twelfth Yearbook. The National Reading Conference. (in Press).

Spache, George D. "A Rationale for Mechanical Methods of Improving Reading," Seventh Yearbook, National Reading Conference for Colleges and Adults. Fort Worth, Texas: Texas Christian University Press, 1958.

Tests

"American College Test," Iowa City, Iowa: American Testing Program, 1959.

"Cooperative English Test, C2, Reading Comprehension," Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1940-1953.

"Davis Reading Test," New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1958.

"Diagnostic Reading Scales," Monterey, California: California Test Bureau, 1963.

"Diagnostic Reading Test," New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1943.

"Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty," New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1955.

"Gates Reading Diagnostic Test," New York: Teachers College, Bureau of Publications, 1945.

"McCullough Word-Analysis Tests," Boston: Ginn and Company, 1962.

McQueen, R. "Diagnostic Reading Scores and College Achievement," Psychological Reports, III (1957), 627-629.

"Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory," New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1943.

Dissertation Abstract

Ziemann, Norman C. "A Study of the Communication Courses in Selected Colleges and Universities in the United States," Dissertation Abstracts, 21:2828-2829, March, 1961.

Manuals

Turabian, Kate L. A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses and Dissertations. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955.

APPENDIX

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONNAIRES RECEIVED FROM SPECIFIC INSTITUTIONS IN THE UNITED NEGRO COLLEGE FUND PROGRAM

Legend

1- Atlanta University
2- Bennett College
3- Bethune-Cookman College
4- Bishop College
5- Clark College
6- Fisk University
7- Huston-Tillotson College
8- Interdenominational Theological Center
9- Johnson C. Smith University
10- Lane College
11- LeMoyne College
12- Livingstone College
13- Morehouse College
14- Morris Brown College
15- Philander Smith College
16- St. Paul's College
17- Spelman College
18- Tougaloo College
19- Tuskegee Institute

1. Do you still offer a course designed for the improvement of reading ability of your students?

Yes- 1,2,3,4,5,7,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,17,18,19

No- 6,8,16

2. What is the title of this course?

Remedial Reading	- 1,5
Reading	- 19
Reading Improvement	- 17
Developmental Reading	- 2,7,9,13,14
Reading Clinic	- 10,15
Freshman Orientation	- 3,9
Pre-College Program	- 4
Other	- 9,11,12,14,18

3. How much academic credit is given?

Quarter basis	- 3
Semester	- 5,7,9,11,13,14,17
No credit	- 1,2,4,10,15,18,19
1 credit	- 3,7
2 credits	- 5,12
3 credits	- 9,11,13,14,17
Other	- 9

4. To which levels do you offer this training?

Freshmen only	- 2,3,4,5,7,10,12,13,14,17,18
All undergraduates	- 9,11,19
Graduates	- 1,19
Not reported	- 15

5. Does your curriculum design involve "slow," "able," and "average" readers?

Slow	- 2,7,19
Able	- 12
Average	- 12
Specify (All)	- 1,4,5,9,13,14,17,18
Not reported	- 3,10,11,15

6. Is the reading instruction offered separately or with the instruction of a "regular" course?

Regular	- 3,4,11,12,18
Separate	- 1,2,5,7,9,13,14,15,17,19

7. Under the auspices of which department or division is the program conducted?

English	- 3,5,9,10,11,12,13,14,18
Reading	- 1,19
Education	- 3,7,9,17
Other	- 4,15
Not Reported	- 2

8. Is this a required freshman course or part of an orientation program?

Required	- 2,5,7,9,10,11,12,13,14,17,18,19
Orientation	- 3
Not required	- 4,15
Other	- 1

9. On which skills do you place the most emphasis?

Comprehension	- 1,2,3,5,7,10,11,15,18
Rate of reading	- 7,18
Other	- 4,14,19
Vocabulary	- 1
All	- 13,17
Not reported	- 9,12

10. What criteria used as a basic "release" policy for clients?

Standardized Tests	- 1,5,14,15,19
Completion of course	- 2,3,9,12,18
Not reported	- 7,10,11,13,17

11. In analyzing reading progress, which factor do you use most frequently?

Rate of reading	- 4,18
Comprehension	- 1,2,3,4,10,15,18
Efficiency	- 1,4,5,9,12,13,14,18,19
Other	- 7,14,17
Not reported	- 11

12. What tests do you use as "pre" and "post" class measurements of growth in reading skills?

Iowa Silent Reading	- 1,2,5,13,17,19
Nelson-Denny	- 12,18,19
Cooperative Reading	- 7,10,19
Stanford Achievement Reading	- 9
Diagnostic Reading Survey	- 9,10,14
Teacher Devised Tests	- 4,14
Tests at end of Texts	- 3
Not reported	- 11

13. To what extent has your reading program grown in the last five years?

Greatly	- 1,5,9,13
Improved	- 4
Very little	- 7,10
First Year	- 14,19
From one teacher to three	- 14,19
Materials increased	- 18
None	- 3,15
Not reported	- 2,11,17

14. Descriptions of basic plans of instruction.

Basically group practice using workbooks with whole group, supplemented by individual practice with mechanical aids	- 3,5,7,,10,13,14,15,18,19
Basically group practice with mechanical aids supplemented by individual practice in workbooks	- 9
Class subdivision into homogeneous groups for workbook practice	- 2,9

Individualized program planned for each individual's needs with no common group work for all - 1,9

Other - 12,17

Not reported - 4,11

15. What mechanical equipment do you employ in your courses? Please indicate how you use each.

Ophthalmograph
- Diagnosis - 1,13

Telebinocular
- Diagnosis - 1,5,13,14,17,18,19

Tachistoscope
- Motivation - 2,12,14,18
- Training - 1,2,5,13,14
- Group Drill - 2,3,5,12,13,14,18

Reading Accelerators
- Diagnosis - 4,15
- Motivation - 3,4,5,10,12,13,17,18,19
- Training - 1,2,3,4,5,9,10,12,13,14,15
- Group Drill - 2,5,15,19

Films
- Diagnosis - 4
- Motivation - 3,4,9,13,14,18,19
- Training - 1,3,4,5,12,13,14,19
- Group Drill - 3,18

Craig Readers
- Motivation - 9,18
- Training - 9,14,18
- Group Drill - 3,18

Listen-Read Tapes
- Diagnosis - 9
- Motivation - 17,19
- Training - 1,5,13,14,17,19
- Group Drill - 5,14,19

Controlled Reader
- Diagnosis - 19
- Motivation - 9,17,18,19
- Training - 2,5,9,12,13,14,18,19
- Group Drill - 2,3,5,9,13,14,19

Not reported - 7,11

16. Which manuals or workbooks do you use as a basic manual for all members of the group?

Robinson, Effective Study Skills	- 3
Shoffer and Shaw, Handbook of English	- 4
McCallister, Purposeful Reading in College	- 7
Glock, The Improvement of College Reading	- 7
Wedeen, College Remedial Reader	- 7
Spache, The Art of Efficient Reading	- 9
Miller, Increasing Reading Efficiency	- 9
Smith, Be A Better Reader (Series)	- 9
Guiler and Coleman, Reading for Meaning	- 9
Weber, Reading and Vocabulary Development	- 10
Blair-Gerber, Better Reading I and II	- 11
Smith and Haag, Learning to Learn	- 12
Lee, Harbrace Vocabulary Guide	- 12
SRA Reading Laboratory	- 15,18
Gilbert, Breaking the Reading Barrier	- 18
Variety	-1,5,13,14,17,19
Not reported	- 2

VITA

ANDERSON, JR., FREDERICK T.

Education: B. S., Morgan State College, Baltimore, Maryland (1959)
Major: English, speech, drama

Graduate Study - Atlanta University (1963-64)

Fellow - University of Maryland (1964-65)

Experience:

Teacher of English, speech, drama; Critic and Demonstration Teacher; Chairman, English Department; Writer, "Course of Study Grade 10 English" and "Course of Study Grade 10 English for Slow Learners"; (1959-1962) Fulbright Scholar/Teacher of English, Kathmandu, Nepal (India); English as a Foreign Language Professor, Supervisor of Student Teachers; (1962-63) Clark College Instructor of English; Spelman College Graduate Assistant in Reading; (1963-64) Reading Consultant, Board of Education, Sandersville, Georgia (Summer, 1964) Reading Specialist, Morehouse College, Atlanta, Georgia (ESI Program), Summer, 1965.

Personal Information:

Married and the father of two children; Member, St. James Episcopal Church, Baltimore, Maryland.

Organizational Membership:

Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity; Masonic Order; member, National Education Association, National Council Teachers of English; Who's Who Among Students in American Colleges and Universities; (1957-58 and 1958-59); National Honor Society; Alpha Psi Omega Honor Society in Dramatics.